GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW LIBRARY
3 0700 00047174 7

HV
6795
.M65K35
1974
c. 2

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
LAW LIBRARY

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW LIBRARY
3 0700 00047174 7

CRIMES AND VICTIMS

Report on the Dayton-San Jose Pilot Survey of Victimizat

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
National Criminal Justice
Information and Statistics Service

HV
6795
.M65 K35
1974
c. 2

RIMES AND VICTIMS

port on the Dayton-San Jose Pilot Survey of Victimization

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
National Criminal Justice
Information and Statistics Service
Washington, D.C.
June 1974

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

Donald E. Santarelli
Administrator

Richard W. Velde
Deputy Administrator
for Policy Development

Charles R. Work
Deputy Administrator
for Administration

National Criminal Justice
Information and Statistics Service

George E. Hall
Acting Assistant Administrator

This report was written by Carol B. Kalish of the Statistics Division of the National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service (NCJISS). The technical appendices were written principally by Dawn D. Nelson of the Statistics Division. Marilyn Marbrook designed and edited the publication for the Statistics Division.

The research design for the experimental project was developed under the direction of Anthony G. Turner of the Statistics Division, NCJISS, and Richard W. Dodge of the Demographic Surveys Division of the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce. Sol Helfand of the Business Division, Bureau of the Census, had primary responsibility for the development of the commercial section of the project. The chief assistants in the research development phases were Charles R. Kindermann and Dawn D. Nelson of the Statistics Division, NCJISS; Marie Argana and Linda Murphy of the Demographic Surveys Division, Bureau of the Census; and Ruth Asin of the Business Division, Bureau of the Census.

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

I The surveys 3

Victimization surveys 3
The surveys in Dayton and San Jose 4
Personal crimes 4
Household crimes 6
Commercial crimes 6
Victimization terminology 7

II The cities 8

III The crimes 11

Rape 12
Robbery 12
Assaults 13
Burglary 15
Larceny 17

IV The victims 19

Multiple victimization 21
Households 21
Victim reporting of crimes 23

V The offenders 25

VI Community attitudes 27

Appendix I. Statistical design, procedures, and data limitations 30

Sample design and data collection 30
Estimation procedures 31
Reliability and validity of the estimates 32
Methodological results 33
The pilot survey and other crime statistics 36

The Uniform Crime Reports 36
The National Crime Panel 37

Appendix II. Survey instruments 39

Appendix III Detailed data tables 71

Guide to tables 71
Definitions of terms 74
I Types of crimes 74
II Other crime terms used 76
III Other general terms 77
IV Types of business establishments 78

Glossary 184
Bibliography 190

ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Form SVC-1, Pilot Cities Victimization Survey, 1971 (household respondent) 41
2. Form SVC-1A, Pilot Cities Victimization Survey, 1971 (self-respondent)
3. Form SVC-2, Personal Crime Incident Report, Pilot Cities Victimization Survey, 1971 59
4. Form SVC-3, Property Crime Incident Report, Pilot Cities Victimization Survey, 1971 62
5. Form S-152, Commercial Victimization Survey, Pilot Cities 65
6. Form S-152 (Supplement A), Burglary Sheet, Commercial Victimization Survey, Pilot Cities 67
7. Form S-152 (Supplement B), Robbery Sheet, Commercial Victimization Survey, Pilot Cities 69

TABLES

Text

1. Percent distribution of crime in Dayton and in San Jose (1970) 9
2. Victimization rates for persons, households, and businesses in Dayton and in San Jose (1970) 10

3. Selected characteristics of crime in Dayton and in San Jose (1970) 11
4. Robberies committed in Dayton and in San Jose (1970) 12
5. Assaults committed in Dayton and in San Jose (1970) 13
6. Burglaries committed in Dayton and in San Jose (1970) 15
7. Larcenies committed in Dayton and in San Jose (1970) 17
8. Selected characteristics of persons victimized by crime in Dayton and in San Jose (1970) 19
9. Selected victimization rates for persons in Dayton and in San Jose (1970) 20
10. Selected characteristics of households victimized by crime in Dayton and in San Jose (1970) 22
11. Selected victimization rates for households in Dayton and in San Jose (1970) 23
12 Citizen's reasons for not reporting incidents to police 24
13. Attitudes and opinions about crime and the police in Dayton and in San Jose by race/ethnic origin, areas of residence, age and sex 28

Appendix I

1. Standard errors of estimated numbers of persons 16 or older 33
2. Standard errors of estimated percentages of persons 16 or older 33
3. Standard errors of estimated numbers of households 34
4. Standard errors of estimated percentages of households 34
5. Standard errors of estimated numbers of businesses in Dayton 35
6. Standard errors of estimated percentages of businesses in Dayton 35
7. Standard errors of estimated numbers of incidents in Dayton businesses 35
8. Standard errors of estimated number of businesses in San Jose 35
9. Standard errors of estimated percentages of businesses in San Jose 36
10. Standard errors of estimated numbers of incidents in San Jose businesses 36
11. Estimates of 1970 incidents by respondent method, Dayton and San Jose combined 36
12. Estimates of 1970 incidents by respondent method by when occurring—Dayton and San Jose combined 37

Appendix III

Section A: Characteristics of victims

1. Number and percent of persons 16 and older victimized by personal crimes, by sex (1970) 80
2. Number and percent of persons 16 and older victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by sex (1970) 82
3. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by age (1970) 84
4. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by age (1970) 86
5. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by race or ethnic origin (1970) 88
6. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by race or ethnic origin (1970) 90
7. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by level of education (1970) 92
8. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by level of education (1970) 94
9. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by marital status (1970) 96
10. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by marital status (1970) 98
11. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by area of residence (1970) 100
12. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by area of residence—inside city (1970) 102

13. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by area of residence (1970) 104
14. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by area of residence (1970) 106

Section B: Characteristics of incidents

15. Personal crimes by relationship of victim to the offender(s) (1970) 108
16. Assaults and robberies by amount of work time lost by victim (1970) 110
17. Robbery and personal larceny (excluding attempts) by amount of loss (1970) 112
18. Number of persons victimized by robbery and assault, by number of times (1970) 113
19. Personal crimes by place of occurrence (1970) 114
20. Personal crimes by time of occurrence (1970) 116
21. Personal crimes by total number of victims involved (1970) 118
22. Stranger-to-stranger personal crimes by total number of victims involved (1970) 120
23. Person reporting offense to police by type of personal crime (1970) 122
24. Person reporting offense to police by type of stranger-to-stranger personal crime (1970) 124
25. Assaults and robberies by type of weapon (1970) 126
26. Stranger-to-stranger assaults and robberies by type of weapon (1970) 128
27. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of personal crime—lone offenders, by age (1970) 130
28. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of personal crime—multiple offenders, by age (1970) 131
29. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of personal crime—lone offenders, by race (1970) 132
30. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of personal crime—multiple offenders, by race (1970) 134
31. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of stranger-to-stranger personal crime—lone offenders, by age (1970) 136
32. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of stranger-to-stranger personal crime—multiple offenders, by age (1970) 138
33. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of stranger-to-stranger personal crime—lone offenders, by race (1970) 140
34. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of stranger-to-stranger personal crime—multiple offenders, by race (1970) 142

Section C: Characteristics of household property crime victims

35. Number and percent of households victimized by property crimes, by race or ethnic origin of head of household (1970) 144
36. Number and percent of households victimized by property crimes, by family income (1970) 146
37. Number and percent of households victimized by property crimes, by owner-renter status (1970) 148
38. Number and percent of households victimized by property crimes, by area of residence (1970) 150
39. Number and percent of households victimized by property crimes, by area of residence—inside city (1970) 152

Section D: Characteristics of household incidents

40. Property crimes by place of occurrence (1970) 154
41. Property crimes by time of occurrence (1970) 156
42. Person reporting offense to police by type of property crime (1970) 158
43. Larceny and burglary by amount of loss and percent recovered (1970) 160
44. Forcible entry by cost of damage and who paid for repairs (1970) 162
45. Number of households by number of property victimizations (1970) 164

Section E: Characteristics of commercial crimes

46. Number of incidents of commercial crime by major type of business (1970) 165
47. Number of incidents of commercial crime by employment size (1970) 166
48. Number of incidents of commercial crime by amount of annual receipts (1970) 167
49. Number of incidents of commercial crime by location of business (1970) 168
50. Number of incidents of commercial crime by time of occurrence (1970) 169
51. Number of incidents of commercial crime by insurance coverage and by police reporting status (1970) 170
52. Number of incidents of commercial crime by amount of loss (including property damage costs) and percent recovered from insurance (1970) 172
53. Number of incidents of commercial crime by number of offenders and whether offenders were apprehended (1970) 174
54. Number of incidents of robbery of businesses in which financial loss occurred, by type of weapon used (1970) 175
55. Number and percent of businesses with incidents of commercial crime by type of crime (1970) 176
56. Number and percent of businesses with incidents of commercial crime by major type of business (1970) 178
57. Number and percent of businesses with incidents of commercial crime by employment size (1970) 179
58. Number and percent of businesses with incidents of commercial crime by amount of annual receipts (1970) 180
59. Number and percent of businesses with incidents of commercial crime by location of business (1970) 182

INTRODUCTION

The National Crime Panel is one of the most significant and promising efforts in the field of criminal justice statistics to be undertaken in recent years. This survey, the first results of which will be published during 1974, measures nationwide the extent and nature of crimes of common theft and assaultive violence. The National Crime Panel is an ongoing program that employs sophisticated sample survey techniques to collect, through interviews, information on the experiences of individuals, households, and businesses as victims of crime. The purpose of the National Crime Panel is to expand and to improve the body of knowledge concerning crime in America by developing ways to use a uniquely qualified and valuable source of information on crimes: its victims.

The idea of turning to the victims of crime for help in learning more about the problem of crime was first proposed by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice in 1967:

> *If we knew more about the characteristics of both offenders and victims, the nature of their relationships, and the circumstances that create a high probability of criminal conduct, it seems likely that crime prevention and control programs could be made much more effective.* (*Task Force Report: Crime and Its Impact—An Assessment*, p.2.)

More recently the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals stated:

> *It is unrealistic to expect any measure of crime to be 100 percent accurate. Victimization surveys should be useful in evaluating reported crime statistics and vice versa. Not only will such cross-comparisons lead to more accurate data, but they should also encourage public confidence in official estimates of the crime problem. A lessening of public debate as to whether crime has gone up or down in the Nation and communities may be a byproduct of the development of victimization surveys.* (*A National Strategy to Reduce Crime*, National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973, p. 32.)

The Task Force on Crime Assessment of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice sponsored three victimization studies, which it used in preparing its final report. The progression from these initial surveys to the National Crime Panel has required a series of methods tests, validation studies, and pilot surveys. An important development in this progression was the pilot survey in Dayton, Ohio, and San Jose, California.

The purpose of the Dayton-San Jose pilot survey was to provide in two different metropolitan settings a full field test of survey

methods and techniques as well as of the survey instrument itself. Because of the experimental nature of the Dayton-San Jose pilot survey, the data collected were to some extent a byproduct of the operation. In fact, the quality of the data was intentionally jeopardized to provide a rigorous test of different interviewing procedures. A detailed discussion of the methodological findings of the Dayton-San Jose pilot survey, as well as a discussion of the impact of methods testing on the quality of the data, is contained in the technical appendices to this report.[1]

Despite their ancillary origin, the data collected in Dayton and San Jose were deemed of sufficient quality to render them suitable for publication. Because of the widespread interest in the data, both intrinsically and as an introduction to the contents of the National Crime Panel, this report has been prepared.

The analysis has been carried out with due regard for data limitations; nevertheless, the interpretations, inferences, and tentative conclusions drawn on the basis of this analysis must await the National Crime Panel for confirmation.

The concepts and definitions contained in this report are generally those employed in the National Crime Panel. In some cases the experience with the Dayton-San Jose survey led to slight modifications and refinements for the National Crime Panel. Where such changes have occurred, they are noted. The definitions of criminal incidents in the pilot survey can be grouped to correspond to the index crimes (excluding homicide) contained in the *Uniform Crime Reports* of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).[2]

The Dayton-San Jose pilot survey was conducted for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration by the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, which also conducts the National Crime Panel.

[1]See Appendix I, Methodological Results.

[2]A discussion of the Dayton-San Jose pilot survey as it relates to the National Crime Panel and the *Uniform Crime Reports* is contained in Appendix I.

I

THE SURVEYS

During January 1971, surveys were conducted in a representative sample of homes and businesses in Montgomery County, Ohio (Dayton), and Santa Clara County, California (San Jose). The subject of these surveys was the extent to which citizens and businesses in these two counties had been the victims of crime in the preceding year. In personal interviews a series of questions was asked to determine if a crime had occurred. If one had, additional questions were asked to determine the nature of the crime and the circumstances surrounding it. Half of the persons interviewed were also asked their attitudes about crime. This report discusses the principal findings of these surveys. Before examining the surveys of Dayton and San Jose in detail, it is necessary to consider victimization surveys in general, their limitations and their potential.

VICTIMIZATION SURVEYS

As the name itself implies, victimization surveys are sample surveys of the population designed to identify and obtain information from persons who have been victims of crime; however, not all types of crime can be satisfactorily investigated with this technique. Victimization surveys are most successful in measuring those crimes with specific victims who understand what happened to them and how it happened and who are willing to report what they know. This definition excludes so-called "victimless" crimes such as drunkenness, drug abuse, prostitution, and gambling. It also excludes crimes without specific victims, such as income tax evasion. Crimes of which the victim may not be aware also cannot be measured. Some attempted crimes fall into this category, as do some cases of fraud or embezzlement. Finally, crimes in which the victim himself has shown a willingness to participate in illegal or questionable activity are not likely to be reported. Various types of swindles, con games, and blackmail are examples.

Despite the limitations on the crimes to which they are applicable, victimization surveys provide ways of looking at these crimes that are not available from other sources. Key among these are the relationship between the victim and the offender and the characteristics of the victim. It has long been acknowledged by criminal authorities that most murders are perpetrated by someone known to the victim, but systematic information on the relationship between victim and offender is not available for other personal confrontation crimes. Victimization surveys can address this problem directly. One of the crimes that causes public concern today is a street attack by unknown assailants. Victimization surveys can measure how frequently such attacks occur and whether the frequency is changing over a period of time.

Victimization surveys also provide the means to study the victim himself. Are some people more likely to become victims than

others? Are persons who have once been victims of a crime more likely to be victims again than if they had never had the first experience? Do the victims of one type of crime differ from victims of another type of crime? If so, how? Victimization surveys make it possible to study the personal as well as the social and economic characteristics of the victim.

Victimization surveys can also provide information on the risk of crime. They provide the information necessary to compute the chances of being robbed or assaulted or having a house or business broken into. Over a period of time, victimization surveys can detect increases or decreases in these probabilities.

The potential of victimization studies is by no means exhausted by the examples given above. The information the studies can put into the hands of those responsible for law enforcement and the administration of justice may provide new insights into the causes of crime and new tools for its prevention.

THE SURVEYS IN DAYTON AND SAN JOSE

The victimization surveys in Dayton and San Jose were limited to a sample of private residences and commercial establishments. No Federal, State, or local government offices or buildings were included in the surveys. The crimes for which information was collected were either assaultive crimes or crimes of common theft. Specifically, they were rape, robbery, assault, burglary, and larceny, including auto theft.[1]

The definitions of these crimes do not necessarily conform to any Federal or State statutes, which vary considerably among themselves. They are, however, compatible with conventional usage and with the definitions used by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) in the *Uniform Crime Reports.*[2]

These five crimes can be examined from various perspectives. They can be examined individually, or they can be grouped into crimes against persons and crimes against property. They can also be classified according to the victim of the crime, whether individuals, households, or businesses. Classifying crimes by victims provides the basis for calculating the risk of crime for different groups as well as providing a new context in which to examine traditional categories of crime. In the following discussion conventional crimes have been grouped by type of victim.

PERSONAL CRIMES

In this study personal crimes were defined as those which bring the victim into direct contact with the offender. These crimes include rape, personal robbery, assault, and personal larceny (purse or pocket picking and purse snatching). Of these, rape is the most serious and the least common. Rape is also a crime which victims are known to be reluctant to report.

Personal robbery, as distinguished from commercial robbery, is also a serious personal crime, because the object is to relieve the person of his property, or property in his custody, by force or threat of force. The force employed may be a weapon (armed robbery) or physical power (strong-arm robbery). In either case the victims are made to feel that they are in physical danger; and, of course, physical injury can and sometimes does result. The distinction between an attempted robbery and a successful robbery is only whether there was any property loss. For example, an incident might be classified as an attempted robbery simply because the victim was not carrying anything of value when held up at gunpoint. An attempted robbery can be quite serious and can result in severe physical injury to the victim.

[1]It will be noted that both murder and kidnaping are missing from this list. There are several reasons: 1) the technique of obtaining information about the crime from the victim is inapplicable to murder and unsuitable in the kidnaping of children; 2) murder and kidnaping, both considered serious crimes, are also relatively rare and therefore difficult to measure in a sample survey; and 3) both are well-reported and well-documented in existing crime statistics and records. Bank robberies were also excluded from the survey because they are also both rare and well-reported.

[2]For the full and precise definition of each of these crimes as used in the Dayton-San Jose pilot survey, see Appendix III and the Glossary.

The classic image of robbery probably is that of a masked man with a gun approaching a couple on the street and telling them to put their hands up. Robbery can, of course, occur anywhere, on the street or in the home. It may be an encounter as dramatic as the one described, or it may be being briefly pinned to the schoolyard fence by one classmate while another classmate makes off with one's lunch money.

Assaults are crimes in which the object is to do physical harm to the victim. Attempted assaults differ from assaults carried out in that in the latter the victim is actually physically attacked and may incur bodily injury.[3] The conventional categories of assault are "simple" and "aggravated." An assault carried out with a weapon is always considered aggravated. An assault carried out without a weapon but resulting in severe injury is also an aggravated assault. Simple assault occurs when the injury, if any, is minor and no weapon is used. Within the scope of crimes of assault are incidents with results no more serious than a minor bruise and incidents that bring the victim near death—but only near—because death would turn the crime into murder.

Attempted assault also covers a wide range of behavior. An attempted assault could be the result of bad aim with a gun, or it could be a non-specific verbal threat to harm the victim. An attempted assault with a weapon is clearly attempted aggravated assault. Attempted assault without a weapon is more difficult to classify in a conventional manner, because it is conjectural how much injury the victim would have sustained had the assault been carried out. In some cases there may have been no intent to carry out the crime. Not all threats of harm are issued in earnest; a verbal threat or a menacing gesture may have been all the offender desired. The intent of the offender obviously cannot be measured in a victimization survey. Victimization surveys can, however, free crime analysis from traditional categories. This report examines assaults by whether a weapon was used and by whether attack or injury occurred, rather than by the usual categories of "aggravated," "simple," and "attempted."[4]

Although the most fearsome form of assault is the brutal, senseless attack by an unknown assailant, it is also the most rare. Much more common is the case where the victim is the loser in a street fight or a domestic spat. There is reason to believe that many of the domestic cases would not be reported in a victimization survey, because the victim himself did not consider the event a crime.

The last group of personal crimes is called personal larceny, or personal theft, to differentiate them from household larceny. In these crimes the offender's objective is to remove something from the person of the victim by stealth. In the Dayton and San Jose pilot survey, personal larceny consists of purse snatching, pocket picking, or the theft of money from the individual. The two identifying elements of personal larceny are that a wallet, purse, or money is removed from the person of the individual and that no force is used.[5] Should, for example, a woman become aware of an attempt to snatch her purse and resist, and should the thief then use force, the crime would escalate to robbery.

In a criminal incident involving a confrontation between an offender and victim, more than one criminal act can take place. For example, a rape may be associated with a robbery, with an assault, or with both. In the Dayton-San Jose pilot survey each criminal incident was counted only once and was classified by the most serious criminal act that took place during the incident. The order of seriousness was: rape; robbery; assault.[6] Consequently, if a person were both raped and robbed, the incident would be classified as a rape.[7] If a person were both robbed and assaulted, the event would be classified as a

[3]This definition diverges somewhat from that employed in the National Crime Panel. In the NCP all assaults without injury are classified as attempted assaults.

[4]The detailed data on assault presented in the Appendix III tables combine both classification schemes.

[5]In the National Crime Panel, personal larceny includes all objects taken from the person of the victim by stealth.

[6]This order of seriousness was based on the seriousness classification system of the FBI *Uniform Crime Reports.*

[7]If a person were both raped and murdered, the event would not be included in this survey.

robbery, but the detailed characteristics of the crime would reveal that injury had occurred.[8]

HOUSEHOLD CRIMES

Crimes against households are crimes that do not involve personal confrontation; consequently, information about the offender cannot be obtained for these crimes. The most serious household crime is burglary. Burglary is the illegal entry or attempted entry of a structure. While the assumption is that the purpose of the entry was to commit a crime, usually theft, no additional crime need take place for a burglary to occur. The entry may be by force, such as picking a lock or breaking a window, or it may be through an open window or an unlocked door. So long as the person entering had no legal right to be present in the structure, a burglary has occurred. Furthermore, the structure entered need not be the house itself for a household burglary to take place. Illegal entry of garage, shed, or any other structure on the premises would also constitute a household burglary. In fact, the burglary need not necessarily occur on the premises. If the breaking and entering occurred in a hotel, a vacation residence, or during a stay at the home of a friend, it would still be classified as a household burglary for the household whose member or members were involved.

The essence of a household crime, as opposed to a personal crime, is that while the latter involves confrontation of victim and offender, the former does not. As a consequence of this distinction, a burglary would turn into a robbery if the burglar, surprised by members of the household, managed to escape with the goods through force or threat of force. The crime would be transformed from a household crime into a personal crime, and the victim would no longer be the household itself, but the member (or members) of the household who discovered the crime.

As mentioned earlier, personal larceny occurs when an object is removed from the person of the victim by stealth. In this study, all other larceny, or theft, was considered a household crime with the entire household as the victim. For a household larceny to occur within the home itself, the thief must be someone with a right to be there, such as a household employee, a delivery man, or a guest. If the person has no right to be in the home, the crime is of course a burglary.

In the Dayton-San Jose pilot survey, larcenies that occurred away from home but did not involve direct contact with the victim, such as a purse stolen at work, or an umbrella stolen at a restaurant, were classified as household crimes. Consequently, the victimization rate for household crimes is considerably higher than it would have been if household larceny had been limited to theft of items from the household.[9] Auto theft is also considered a household larceny, because automobiles are usually considered household possessions. Auto theft includes not only cars but also trucks, motorcycles, and other automotive vehicles.

Household larceny, as defined in the Dayton-San Jose pilot survey, can consist of the theft of the family jewels, the garden hose, the household head's briefcase, or the family car. The common elements are stealth, absence of force, and absence of personal confrontation. The theft is usually classified as grand larceny if the stolen property is valued at $50 or more and petty larceny if it is valued at less than $50.[10]

COMMERCIAL CRIMES

Commercial crimes differ from household and personal crimes in several important ways. One is that a business or commercial establishment, rather than an individual or a household, is the victim. Another is that the most com-

[8]The method of crime classification in the National Crime Panel identifies each crime that occurred during a single criminal incident, e.g. rape with and without robbery or robbery with and without assault. Consequently, the National Crime Panel is not required to rely on a predetermined order of seriousness in the classification of events.

[9]In the National Crime Panel, theft of personal property occurring away from home is tabulated separately and classified as a personal crime.

[10]In the State of California, grand larceny is $250 or more. Since the terms "petty" and "grand" larceny are more traditional than analytically useful, they have been dropped from the National Crime Panel in favor of more detail on dollar amounts.

mon commercial crimes—shoplifting and employee theft—are virtually impossible to measure in terms of individual events. Most incidents of shoplifting and employee theft occur undetected. The possibility of undetected crimes is always present when there is an unexplained inventory shrinkage, but usually the businessman does not know whether shoplifting, employee theft, faulty recordkeeping, or all three are involved.

Consequently, in Dayton and San Jose only two types of commercial crime were measured: robbery and burglary. These crimes are identical to robbery of persons and burglary of private households except that the structure entered and the property taken belongs to the business. In a business robbery, as in a personal robbery, there must be personal confrontation and the threat or use of force. Anyone, such as an employee, customer, or bystander, who is threatened, injured, or robbed during the course of a business robbery is, of course, a victim of crime, as is the business establishment itself.

VICTIMIZATION TERMINOLOGY

The crimes studied in Dayton and San Jose were defined in accordance with definitions generally accepted in the criminal justice field. Special distinctions were the subdivision of larceny into personal larceny and household larceny, the subdivision of robbery into personal robbery and commercial robbery, and the subdivision of burglary into household burglary and commercial burglary. Other terminology used in this report is necessarily specific to victimization surveys.

One problem that must be faced in dealing with victimization terminology is the quantification of the criminal act. In measuring criminal acts, what shall be the unit of measurement? In the Dayton-San Jose pilot survey, the basis for measurement was the criminal incident. Each criminal incident involved at least one victim, at least one offender, and at least one offense. In cases where more than one offense occurred, only the most serious was recorded.[11] However, all victims and, in personal crimes, all offenders were recorded for each incident. It was assumed that only one criminal incident could occur at one place at one time.[12]

Because every criminal incident must have one victim but can have more than one, the total number of victims during any given period will exceed the number of incidents. The total number of victims during that same period will also exceed the total number of persons victimized because one person victimized on two occasions is counted as two victims. Information was collected in Dayton and San Jose in such a way as to make it possible to count the number of incidents and the number of victims as well as the number of persons who had been victimized. In both Dayton and San Jose the number of persons victimized at least once and the number of criminal incidents were about the same. The total number of victims, however, was significantly higher, reflecting both persons who were victims of more than one criminal incident and incidents with more than one victim.

---

[11]In the National Crime Panel all crimes are recorded for each event.

[12]There is one exception to this assumption. If, during a visit at the home of a friend, the home were burglarized and any of the visitor's belongings were stolen, this one criminal act would be reported twice, once by the visitor and once by the homeowner. Consequently, it would be counted as two separate incidents of burglary, because two households were affected. This situation, however, is rare.

II

THE CITIES

Dayton and San Jose are the central cities of the metropolitan areas of the same names and the county seats respectively of Montgomery County, Ohio, and Santa Clara County, California.[1] Montgomery County and Santa Clara County are distinctly different places.

Santa Clara County, which by itself comprises the San Jose Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA), is located at the southern tip of San Francisco. In addition to the city of San Jose, with a population of almost half a million, Santa Clara County contains the cities of Palo Alto, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, and Mountainview, each with a population of between 50,000 and 100,000. The county itself has a population of one million. The San Jose area experienced extraordinary growth during the 1950's and 1960's; the population of Santa Clara County more than tripled in 20 years, and the population of the city of San Jose doubled in the last 10.

Montgomery County, the central county of the Dayton SMSA, is located in southwest Ohio about 50 miles north of Cincinnati. Much smaller in area and more densely populated than Santa Clara County, Montgomery County has a population of 600,000. Montgomery County has about 70 percent of the population of the entire Dayton SMSA, which includes four counties surrounding Montgomery. In addition to Dayton, with a population of a quarter of a million, Montgomery County contains the city of Kettering, with a population of 70,000. Neither Montgomery County nor the Dayton SMSA has grown at a rate approaching that of the San Jose SMSA. Between 1960 and 1970 the population of Montgomery County grew by only 15 percent, and, as was the case for many Northern cities, the population of the city of Dayton actually declined, in part because of extensive expressway construction.

The Dayton metropolitan area has had a pattern of growth and development that is fairly typical of Northern industrial cities. Dayton has been a significant industrial center for many decades, but the growth of the city of Dayton tapered off in the period after World War II. Its present population is the same as in 1950. The lack of overall growth in the central city has masked two significant population movements: that of blacks into the central city and whites into the suburbs. Blacks now represent almost a third of the population of the city of Dayton, but the suburbs are almost entirely white. For Montgomery County as a whole, blacks represent 14 percent of the population.

San Jose was the center of the prosperous agricultural region until it became caught up in

[1]The victimization surveys were conducted throughout the urbanized portions of Montgomery County and Santa Clara County. In both cases the area surveyed included a substantial majority of the population of the entire Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA); therefore, the SMSA name will be used to designate each place in the remainder of this report.

the exploding development of the Bay Area. The phenomenal growth of both the city and the metropolitan area since the 1950's has resulted more from outside pressures than expansion from within. Consequently, San Jose developed in a multinodal pattern with no clear-cut distinction between urban and suburban. This pattern of metropolitan development, heavily influenced by the automobile, is characteristic of much of the urban growth in California. It contrasts sharply with the development of Dayton, where the growth pattern, typical of many older cities, has been one of concentric circles radiating from a central business district.

The Western character of San Jose is also apparent in its racial and ethnic composition. The principal minority group in Santa Clara County is Spanish American. Persons of Spanish origin or descent represent about 14 percent of the total county population. Spanish Americans are longtime residents of the area, and they are distributed throughout the county. Oriental Americans account for 4 percent of the county population; blacks, 2 percent.

The position of minority groups with respect to the majority population also shows some significant variations in the two metropolitan areas. In Dayton the black population has a median educational attainment and a median family income substantially below that of the rest of the population. In San Jose blacks equal the majority population in both education and income, and oriental Americans exceed the majority population in both. Spanish Americans, on the other hand, have less schooling and less income, although the income differential is very small.

Montgomery County and Santa Clara County are strikingly different with respect to climate. Montgomery County's climate is quite typical for a Northern inland city: cold winters, hot summers, and an average amount of rainfall. Santa Clara County has a much milder climate: the temperature rarely falls below freezing, and the midsummer temperatures average 5 degrees below Dayton's. It is also substantially drier than Dayton, with only 13 inches of rainfall per year.

Montgomery County is a more heavily industrial area than Santa Clara County. A higher proportion of its work force is employed in manufacturing industries and in blue-collar jobs than in Santa Clara County. It also has a higher median income and a lower unemployment rate. On the other hand, Santa Clara County has a much larger proportion of its labor force employed as technical and professional workers, as might be expected from its higher median education.

In view of the distinctive characters of these two metropolitan areas, the similar pictures they present with respect to crime and victimization is quite extraordinary. (See Tables 1 and 2.) If the difference in their respective population bases is taken into account, then the similarities in the extent of crime, the patterns of crime, the extent of victimization, the types of victims, and the manner in which they were victimized produce city profiles that are almost interchangeable.

When differences in patterns of crime and patterns of victimization occur, they usually spring from the different experiences of minority groups in the two cities. Blacks in Dayton are clearly in an economically disadvantageous position with respect to the majority white population. They are concentrated in the low-income areas of the inner city, which have higher victimization rates

Table 1. Percent distribution of crime in Dayton and in San Jose (1970)

	Dayton	San Jose
Total crimes	100.0 Percent	100.0 Percent
Rape	.2	.2
Robbery	2.6	1.9
Personal	2.3	1.6
Commercial	.3	.3
Assault	9.1	8.6
Larceny	63.4	66.6
Personal	1.2	1.0
Household	58.8	63.0
Auto theft	3.3	2.6
Burglary	24.7	22.7
Household	19.7	19.6
Commercial	4.9	3.2

Note: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

than other areas. Blacks also have higher victimization rates for burglary and auto theft than do whites. The comparative disadvantage for Spanish Americans in San Jose is much less. Spanish Americans are not as highly concentrated in low-income areas, and the low-income areas themselves are not as localized and dense. These facts are reflected in the victimization rates for San Jose's Spanish population. Except for these racial and ethnic differences, the basic similarity between the two cities is quite striking.

In Dayton and in San Jose the chances of being personally victimized by crime—that is, of being robbed, assaulted, or having one's purse or pocket picked—were 4 in 100 in 1970. The chances of living in a household which had been victimized at some time during the year were 40 in 100.[2] The chances of having one's business robbed or burglarized were 20 in 100. Furthermore, in both cities, more than 60 percent of all crimes were crimes of theft; 25 percent were burglaries; 10 percent were assaults; and less than 3 percent were robberies. The consistent pattern presented for the two cities at the aggregate level is also present when crimes and victims are examined in greater detail.

[2]This figure is inflated by the classification of theft of personal items away from home as household crimes.

Table 2. Victimization rates for persons, households, and businesses in Dayton and in San Jose (1970)

	Victimization Rates	
	Dayton	San Jose
Crimes against persons:[1]		
Rape	*	0.1
Assault	3.2	3.3
Personal larceny	0.4	0.3
Robbery	0.8	0.7
Property crimes against households:[2]		
Larceny	29.3	31.9
Burglary	12.2	12.5
Auto theft	2.4	2.0
Crimes against businesses:[3] (Commercial)		
Robbery	2.1	2.1
Burglary	20.6	18.3

[1]Victimization rate: Number of persons per 100 population 16 and older who were victims of rape, assault, personal larceny, or robbery.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[2]Victimization rate: Number of households per 100 households that were victims of larceny, burglary, or auto theft.

[3]Victimization rate: Number of businesses per 100 businesses that were victims of robbery or burglary.

III

THE CRIMES

Two hundred and fifty thousand incidents of rape, assault, robbery, burglary, or larceny occurred in San Jose during 1970; 140,000 occurred in Dayton. (See Table 3.) The overriding factor in the different levels of total crime in these two metropolitan areas, as well as the different levels for specific crimes, is simply their different population sizes; their rates of criminal offense are quite similar. Consequently, the nature of crime in the two cities will be discussed primarily in terms of proportions, rather than absolute levels.

Table 3. Selected characteristics of crime in Dayton and in San Jose (1970)

	Dayton	San Jose
Total incidents:		
Number	138,980	253,337
Percent	100	100
Commercial	5	4
Personal	13	11
Household	82	85
Percent of incidents reported to police:[1]		
Commercial	86	76
Personal	52	39
Household	41	40
Percent of personal incidents:		
With one offender	63	65
With one victim	86	84
Committed by strangers	60	66
Percent of household incidents:[2]		
With no loss	17	14
With loss of less than $50	3	2
With loss of more than $500	3	3
With partial or complete recovery	23	23

[1]These figures are based on information supplied by the victim during the survey and not on police records.

[2]Excludes auto thefts, which comprise approximately 5 percent of household incidents in each city.

In both cities the most frequent crimes were the least serious, and the most serious crimes were the least frequent. Rape, for example, accounted for less than one-half of 1 percent of all crimes committed in both cities. Robberies accounted for 2.5 percent of the crime in Dayton and 2 percent of the crime in San Jose. Aggravated assault at the hands of an unknown assailant accounted for less than 2.5 percent of all crimes in each city. The only property crime as infrequent as the assaultive crimes was auto theft, which accounted for about 3 percent of the crimes in each city. At the other extreme were property crimes with no loss or loss amounting to less than $50. These accounted for more than 50 percent of all crimes committed in both cities.

Some basic patterns emerge from the data collected on incidents of crime in Dayton and San Jose. For example, most crimes against persons were committed by a stranger and involved a lone victim. Most crimes were committed at some place other than the home. Few crimes of any type were committed between midnight and dawn, but the reason may be simply that there are fewer people abroad at this hour. The circumstances

and settings of incidents of crime show considerable variation, however, when each type of crime is examined separately.

RAPE

Rape is generally considered the most serious crime of those studied in the Dayton-San Jose pilot survey. It was also the crime most rarely reported. For calendar 1970, 600 rapes were reported in San Jose and fewer than 500 were reported in Dayton. Despite the fact that rape clearly is an infrequent crime, there is reason to believe that it is less well reported than any other crime included in the survey. Rape is not only a traumatic experience for the victim, but also the only crime for which the victim can be socially stigmatized. More so than for any other crime, there are strong pressures on the victim not to report the incident to a complete stranger.

The rape incidents in both Dayton and San Jose are too few to permit examination of the details of the crimes.[1] It is noteworthy, however, that in San Jose every rape incident reported involved an attempted rape rather than a rape that was carried out. As it is unreasonable to assume that no rapes were successfully committed in San Jose in 1970, it may be that victims of attempted rapes were more willing to report them or that some successful rapes were reported as attempted rapes, because the victim found it less distressing to report the latter than the former.

ROBBERY

In 1970, 3,600 robberies were committed in Dayton, and 4,700 robberies were committed in San Jose. (See Table 4.) In both places the overwhelming number of robberies were committed against persons. Commercial establishments were the target of robbery in less than 15 percent of the incidents of robbery in each city. When a commercial robbery did occur, it was more likely to be committed with a gun, more likely to be successful (to result in a financial loss to the victim), and less likely to involve attack or injury than robbery of persons. The most frequent personal robbery involved a single victim who was set upon by two or more strangers who were likely to be armed. In personal robberies that were successful, the victim was likely to be attacked or injured.

In both Dayton and San Jose the favorite targets of commercial robberies were small establishments. A large majority of the commercial robberies in both cities occurred in places with fewer than 20 employees and less than half a million dollars in annual receipts. Usually these places were wholesale and retail stores. Commercial robberies were about as likely to occur elsewhere in the county as inside the central city.

The preferred time for robbing a store was between 6 p.m. and midnight. About half the robberies were committed by a lone offender. Almost all the robberies were committed with a weapon, and the weapon was almost always a gun. Ninety percent of the robberies committed with a gun were successful. Although the loss was not very large, usually between $10

Table 4. Robberies committed in Dayton and in San Jose (1970)

	Dayton	San Jose
Total number of incidents:	3,638	4,690
Commercial	438	700
Percent	(12)	(15)
Personal	3,200	3,990
Percent	(88)	(85)
Percent of personal robberies committed:		
With weapon	45	52
By strangers	81	83
By lone offender	41	47
Reported to police[1]	76	47
At home	17	14
In public places	63	52
At office/school/store/elsewhere	20	34
In the daytime (6 a.m. to 6 p.m.)	33	40
In the evening and at night (6 p.m. to 6 a.m.)	67	60

[1]These figures are based on information supplied by the victim during the survey and not on police records.

[1]As noted earlier, rapes culminating in murder are excluded from this survey.

and $250, most of the establishments robbed were not insured. In both cities less than 1 percent of the commercial robberies resulted in injuries to owners, customers, or employees. More than 90 percent of the commercial robberies were reported to the police.[2]

Roughly 4 out of 5 personal robberies in Dayton and San Jose involved a single victim, and 4 out of 5 robberies were committed by persons unknown to the victim. More than half the robberies of persons in Dayton and San Jose occurred out in the open—on the street, in a park or playground, or in a parking lot. More than half of the robberies occurred between 6 p.m. and midnight, but a substantial proportion also occurred during the day. In 60 percent of the personal robberies in Dayton and 50 percent of the personal robberies in San Jose, more than one offender was involved.

More variety in the choice of weapons occurred for personal robbery than for commercial robbery. In both Dayton and San Jose, half the personal robbery incidents involved the use of weapons. Although the weapons used ranged from sticks to brass knuckles, the gun was the most frequently used weapon in Dayton; the knife, in San Jose. The gun appeared to be as effective a weapon in personal robbery as in commercial robbery. The combined experience of both cities indicates that 85 percent of the robberies with guns resulted in financial loss to the victim. When any type of weapon other than a gun was used, the rate of success was no greater than when no weapon was used at all. Half of all robbery incidents, armed or unarmed, in which no gun was used were successful.

Two-thirds of all personal robbery victims in Dayton and half of all personal robbery victims in San Jose had something taken from them in the course of the robbery. Most of the losses were valued at between $10 and $250. When a robbery was successful, the victim was asked in the survey whether he was attacked or injured during the robbery. In two-thirds of the cases, victims reported that they had been attacked or injured. Few victims, however, reported that they had lost time from work as a result of injury, or for any other reason connected with the robbery.

The robbery of an individual was not as likely to be reported to the police as the robbery of a commercial establishment. Three-fourths of the personal robberies in Dayton and half of the personal robberies in San Jose were reported to the police. The pattern of reporting was the same in both cities. A personal robbery was most likely to be reported if it was committed with a weapon or if it resulted in injury. Even so, for every type of personal robbery committed, proportionately fewer were reported to the police in San Jose than in Dayton.

ASSAULTS

In 1970, 13,000 assaults were committed in Dayton, and 22,000 assaults were committed in San Jose. (See Table 5.) In both cities assaults accounted for slightly less than 10 percent of all crimes surveyed but about 75 percent of all crimes directed against persons. Crimes of assault differ from other crimes reported in this survey in several significant ways.

Table 5. Assaults committed in Dayton and in San Jose (1970)

	Dayton	San Jose
Total number of incidents	12,690	21,740
Aggravated	1,440	2,320
Simple	3,620	7,410
Attempted	7,630	12,010
Percent of assaults committed:		
With weapon	43	39
By strangers	51	59
By lone offender	70	68
Reported to police[1]	47	38
At home	22	22
At office/school/store	28	19
In public places	33	36
Elsewhere	17	22
In the daytime (6 a.m. to 6 p.m.)	38	48
In the evening (6 p.m. to midnight)	48	43
At night (midnight to 6 a.m.)	14	9

[1]These figures are based on information supplied by the victim during the survey and not on police records.

[2]For a discussion of the meaning of the term "reported to the police" in the context of the Dayton-San Jose pilot survey, see "Victim Reporting of Crime" in IV, The Victims.

The motive in cases of assault is not as readily apparent as it is for other crimes surveyed. Assault is the only personal crime included in this survey in which the offender is about as likely to be a person known to the victim as he is to be a stranger. Incidents of assault virtually always involved only one victim, even though approximately a fourth of the victims were set upon by more than one offender. Finally, the seriousness of any single incident of assault may range from trivial to extremely grave.

Two critical factors in any incident of assault are whether a weapon was used and whether an attack or injury resulted.[3] The pattern presented in assaults by these two factors is quite similar for Dayton and San Jose. In both cities a fourth of all assault incidents involved neither attack, nor injury, nor a weapon. This group of assaults can be considered the least serious, but it is nevertheless quite possible to be terrorized by unarmed persons, especially if they have a strong numerical advantage. Incidents involving weapons, but no attack or injury, and incidents involving attack or injury, but no weapons, each accounted for about a third of the assaults in Dayton and San Jose.

Only in a small proportion of the assaults with injury but without weapons was the injury severe. In fact, assault incidents in which victims were severely injured without the use of weapons accounted for only 2 percent of all assaults in each city. Assault incidents with weapons that resulted in any injury at all, mild or severe, accounted for 10 percent of all assault incidents in each of the two cities. The role of weapons in assaults and the frequency of injury seemed little affected by whether the attacker was a stranger or an acquaintance. The picture changes sharply for both cities when the offender is not merely an acquaintance but a relative of the victim.

Assaults in which the offender was a relative were a small proportion of total assault incidents, 5 percent in each city. Assaults initiated by relatives were far more likely to involve attack or injury (though without weapons) than assaults initiated by acquaintances or by strangers. Roughly three-fourths of all assaults by relatives involved attack or injury even though no weapon was employed. One possible explanation for this strikingly different pattern is that oral threats or physical attempts by a relative to harm an individual are not taken seriously, or perhaps even remembered, unless an actual attack occurs. The rarity of weapons, even unconventional ones, in these assaults by relatives suggests that many of them erupt spontaneously out of family disputes. In any case the small number of assaults committed by relatives appears to contradict the view that many assaults that come to public attention are byproducts of domestic altercations.

The role of weapons in assaults in the two surveyed cities differed somewhat from the role of weapons in robberies. In both Dayton and San Jose, two-fifths of all assaults and attempted assaults involved weapons. Guns were used more frequently than knives in Dayton; in San Jose the use of each was about the same. In both cities, however, some weapon other than a gun or knife was employed in roughly half the armed assaults. The variety of other weapons used was large, including such unconventional items as ashtrays and baseball bats. Despite the wide variety of weapons employed in assaults, it was these miscellaneous weapons, not guns and knives, that caused the most injuries. Here again, there were no apparent differences between incidents involving strangers and incidents involving persons known to the victim.

In both Dayton and San Jose, assaults in which guns were used were less likely to result in injury than any other kind of assault, armed or not.[4] In fact, 90 percent of all assault incidents involving guns did not result in injury. By comparison with the effect of a gun on the outcome of a robbery, the effect of a gun on the outcome of an assault seems relatively small. It may be that the lack of injury merely represents bad aim on the part of numerous

[3]Incidents in which no attack or injury occurred are classified as attempted assaults; incidents in which the injury, if any, was slight and no weapon was involved, as simple assaults; incidents in which the injury was severe or weapon-inflicted, as aggravated assaults.

[4]Assault with guns in which the injury was fatal are, of course, excluded from this discussion.

assailants. It may be that simply brandishing a gun produced the results intended by the offender. It is also possible that the lethal potential of a gun makes any confrontation with it both frightening and memorable and, as a consequence, more likely to be reported than confrontations with other weapons, even though no injury follows.

As stated earlier, about 9 out of 10 assaults were against a lone victim. Three out of four were precipitated by a lone assailant. Half the time in San Jose and more than half the time in Dayton, this lone offender was known by his victim. When the victim did find himself facing two or more attackers, they were usually a group of strangers.

Except for the number of attackers, there appeared to be very little difference in the nature of the assault or in its outcome when assaults by strangers are compared to assaults by acquaintances. This similarity is perhaps not as surprising as it might first appear. It has been pointed out that very few of the assailants were relatives of the victims. The relationship of the victim to other offenders known to him could be a longtime association or a bare acquaintance. Since the strength of the relationship between a victim and an offender with whom he is acquainted is not known, the term acquaintance should not be considered as a synonym for friend or associate.

The settings of assaults were quite varied. They were about as likely to occur in the daytime (between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m.) as in the evening (between 6 p.m. and midnight). Only about 10 percent occurred between midnight and 6 a.m. Assaults were more likely to occur indoors than outdoors, but only 1 out of 5 assaults occurred in or near the home of the victim. Close to half of the assaults occurred in such places as stores, offices, schools, or other peoples' houses. It appears, however, that assaults involving serious injury or minor weapon-inflicted injury were more likely to occur outdoors than in any particular indoor setting.

Assaults were reported to the police about half the time in Dayton and somewhat less in San Jose. Assaults by strangers were hardly more likely to be reported to the police than attacks by acquaintances. However, more serious incidents were reported more often than minor incidents. Whatever the nature of the assault, it was somewhat more likely to be reported to the police in Dayton than in San Jose.

BURGLARY

Burglaries were more likely to occur at night (between midnight and 6 a.m.) than any other crime surveyed. Since successful burglary requires stealth, it is not surprising that relatively more are undertaken in those hours when the fewest number of people are up and about. In 1970, 35,000 burglaries were committed in Dayton and 57,500 in San Jose. (See Table 6.) Twenty percent of the Dayton burglaries and

Table 6. Burglaries committed in Dayton and in San Jose (1970)

	Dayton	San Jose
Total number of incidents	34,292	57,607
Commercial	6,852	8,037
Percent	(20)	(14)
Household	27,440	49,570
Percent	(80)	(86)
Percent of commercial burglaries:		
Insured	19	20
With losses of more than $10	74	78
Reported to police[1]	85	74
With recovery	33	34
Percent of household burglaries:		
With forcible entry	40	33
With losses of more than $10	55	60
Reported to police[1]	57	54
With recovery	28	24
Percent of burglaries occurring:		
In the daytime (6 a.m. to 6 p.m.)	29	33
In the evening (6 p.m. to midnight)	28	24
At night (midnight to 6 a.m.)	24	17
At undetermined time	19	26

[1]These figures are based on information supplied by the victim during the survey and not on police records.

15 percent of the San Jose burglaries took place at commercial establishments. The majority of these occurred between midnight and 6 a.m.; only a small number occurred in the daytime. Household burglaries were much more evenly divided among daytime, evening, and night, presumably because many households are less likely to be occupied during the day than commercial establishments.

Commercial burglaries outnumbered commercial robberies by 16 to 1 in Dayton and by 11 to 1 in San Jose. Even more so than robbers, burglars sought out small establishments as targets, perhaps because smaller establishments can less easily afford sophisticated burglary prevention and detection apparatus. In any case, in both cities more than half of the burglaries were committed at establishments with less than $100,000 in annual receipts, and about three-fourths were committed in establishments with fewer than eight employees. Wholesale and retail trade establishments were prime targets for burglary, but service establishments such as filling stations, barber shops, and dry cleaners were also frequent targets. Together, trade and service establishments accounted for four-fifths of the commercial robberies in both Dayton and San Jose.

Commercial burglaries were somewhat more likely to occur outside the central city than they were to occur inside. Virtually none of the burglaries occurring outside of the central city took place in low-income areas, whereas half of the central-city burglaries in Dayton and most of the central-city burglaries in San Jose occurred in the poorer areas of the city.

Theft of property took place in only about half of the commercial burglary incidents in Dayton and San Jose. The rest of the time the burglars either failed to gain entry or failed to take anything. Two-fifths of the successful burglaries resulted in losses of more than $250 to the burglarized establishment, indicating that successful commercial burglaries in Dayton and San Jose were in most cases more profitable than successful commercial robberies. Although two-thirds of the losses from burglary were not recovered, even in part, only one-third of the establishments with losses were insured. In the large majority of commercial burglary cases in both cities, no one was apprehended as far as the victim knew.

Commercial burglary incidents were well reported to the police, although not quite as well reported as commercial robberies. Virtually all insured establishments reported burglary incidents, presumably because a police report is usually a prerequisite to filing an insurance claim. Least likely to be reported were incidents in which the burglar attempted but did not gain entry to the premises of an uninsured firm. Only half of these incidents were reported to the police in San Jose.

Household burglaries were not as well reported to the authorities in either Dayton or San Jose as their commercial counterparts. They were much more likely to be reported if the home had been broken into than if the burglar had entered through an unlocked door or window or if the burglar had tried but failed to get in. Only two-fifths of the attempted forcible entries in Dayton and San Jose were reported to the police. Closer to half of all unlawful entries were reported, and about three-fourths of all forcible entries were reported. The likelihood of reporting a household burglary also tended to increase with the value of the items taken.

In 80 percent of the household burglaries the burglars got inside, half the time by breaking in and half the time without breaking in. When the burglar got inside, by whatever means, something was taken in 80 percent of the cases, but in more than half the cases the amount of loss was less than $100.

The average amount of loss resulting from forcible entries was substantially larger than the amount of loss resulting when force was not required to gain entry. Furthermore, in both Dayton and San Jose a forcible entry almost never resulted in a loss of less than $10, while an unlawful entry did in roughly one-fifth of the incidents. It may be that unlawful entry is a more spontaneous crime. A door ajar or an open window may attract a burglar with no particular objective in mind who seizes whatever is readily available and hastily departs. A burglar who makes the effort and takes the risk of breaking into a residence is more likely to have an objective

in mind and to seek out something of enough value to make his break-in worthwhile.

Although forcible entry and illegal entry were roughly equal in each city, there were proportionately somewhat more illegal entries in San Jose than in Dayton. This could possibly be an indication of climatic effects on crime. Presumably the milder year-round climate of San Jose would be more conducive to leaving doors and windows open or unlocked than would the colder winters in Dayton.

In roughly 10 percent of the burglaries, the incident took place away from the usual residence of the household burglarized. Presumably the household members burglarized were on a trip or vacation and were burglarized in their hotel or vacation lodgings. In three-fourths of the household burglaries none of the stolen goods were recovered, but in about 15 percent of the cases all of the stolen property was recovered.

Table 7. Larcenies committed in Dayton and in San Jose (1970)

	Dayton	San Jose
Total number of incidents	83,440	162,080
Personal	1,700	2,510
Pocket picking	1,440	2,150
Household	81,740	159,570
Auto theft	4,630	6,620
Percent of household larcenies committed:		
With losses of more than $50	27	29
Reported to police[1]	34	34
At home	35	32
At office/school/store	15	18
In public places	39	33
Elsewhere	11	17
In the daytime (6 a.m. to 6 p.m.)	38	49
In the evening and at night (6 p.m. to 6 a.m.)	62	51

[1]These figures are based on information supplied by the victim during the survey and not on police records.

LARCENY

By far the most frequent crime in Dayton and San Jose was the crime of larceny, or simple theft. Two-thirds of the crimes reported in both cities were larcenies of one form or another, even though the survey did not include two very common forms of theft: employee theft and shoplifting. About 2 percent of the larcenies committed in both Dayton and San Jose consisted of theft directly from the person of the victim. (See Table 7.) In both cities these personal larcenies consisted almost entirely of pickpocket incidents. Another 5 percent of the thefts were thefts of vehicles, principally automobiles. About two-thirds of the thefts were evenly divided between those that occurred in and around the home and those that occurred in outdoor public places such as streets, parks, parking lots, and playing fields. The remainder of the thefts occurred in offices, schools, stores, and other places.

Although personal larceny and auto theft were the least common types of theft, they could be considered the more serious; as personal larceny always contains the potential for injury to the victim, and automobiles generally represent items of substantial value. Although about 90 percent of all successful automobile thefts were reported to the police, this high rate of reporting may be influenced by insurance claim requirements. Only 25 percent of the unsuccessful attempts at auto theft were reported to the police. Personal larcenies were not well reported; the police were told of half of the incidents in Dayton and of a third of the incidents in San Jose.

Incidents of car theft occurred around the clock, but they were three times more likely to occur in the evening or at night than during the daytime. Most often the cars were not taken from the household garage or driveway. In fact, in both cities 70 percent of all car theft incidents occurred on the street, at playgrounds, in parks or open fields, or from parking lots, although these parking lots were not necessarily those served by attendants. The ratio of successful car thefts to unsuccessful attempts was 3 to 1. Although this may indicate that car theft is a crime with a high success rate, it is more likely to indicate that attempts to steal cars can easily go undetected.

Most personal larcenies involved only one victim. Because personal larceny is basically a crime of stealth, many victims were unable to say whether there had been more than one offender. When the victim could report on the number of offenders involved, those in San Jose usually reported that there had been only one offender; but those in Dayton usually reported that there had been more than one. In both cities the victim usually reported a loss of between $10 and $250. As might be expected, pocket picking was not likely to occur in or around the home, but there was no one particular setting in which it was prone to occur. Most personal larcenies occurred in the daytime in San Jose, but in Dayton they were as likely to occur in the evening as during the daytime. Incidents of personal larceny after midnight were rare in both cities.

The remainder of the theft incidents includes all thefts of personal or private household property (except vehicles) stolen from any place except from the person of an individual. Only 10 percent of these crimes resulted in no loss to the victim, again no doubt because an unsuccessful theft attempt is apt to remain undiscovered. When there was economic loss, it was usually less than $50. Loss amounting to more than $50 accounted for only a third of all successful incidents, and of these, 95 percent were less than $250. Whatever the loss, the chances of eventual recovery were slim. In 80 percent of the cases nothing was ever recovered. In about 15 percent of the cases, however, the entire amount was recovered.

Larcenies that occurred in outdoor public places—streets, parking places, parks, etc.—were more likely to be grand larcenies than those that occurred in homes, schools, offices, stores, or similar places. The time at which a theft occurred does not appear to be related in any way to the amount of loss; the pattern for larcenies amounting to $50 or more was about the same as it was for larcenies of less than $50 in both cities. The timing of thefts was more evenly distributed throughout the day than for most other crimes. In addition there were slight differences in the pattern for Dayton and San Jose. In San Jose half the crimes occurred during the daytime and only 20 percent between midnight and dawn. In Dayton larceny was a little less likely to occur during the daytime and somewhat more likely to occur between midnight and dawn.

Larcenies of more than $50 were more likely to be reported to the police than smaller thefts. On the whole, 60 percent of the $50-or-more larcenies were reported, but the reporting rate tended to increase with the amount. More than 80 percent of all larcenies with losses of more than $500 were reported. At the other extreme, larcenies of less than $50 were no better reported than attempted larcenies. The police were informed of only 1 out of every 5.

IV

THE VICTIMS

Sixteen thousand persons 16 years old or older in Dayton and 28,000 persons 16 or older in San Jose were victims of assault, robbery, or personal larceny at least once during 1970. (See Tables 8 and 9.) In both cities approximately 75 percent were victims of assault, more than 15 percent were victims of robbery, and 10 percent were victims of personal larceny. The victims of robbery and personal larceny were almost always accosted by strangers. The victims of assault were about equally divided between those who knew their assailants and those who did not. On the whole, 70 percent of the victims in both cities were victimized by strangers.

Male victims outnumbered female victims 2 to 1, and younger victims were substantially more numerous than victims in the central or older age groups. About half of the victim population in both cities was younger than 25, although victims in Dayton tended to be slightly older than those in San Jose. The relative youthfulness of the victims was reflected in their educational and marital characteristics. Seventy percent of the victim population in Dayton and 60 percent of the victim population in San Jose were attending high school or had attended high school, but not college. The proportion of the San Jose victims with some college—about a third—was twice the proportion in Dayton and reflects, in part, the higher median level of education in San Jose. Forty percent of the victims in both Dayton

Table 8. Selected characteristics of persons victimized by crime in Dayton and in San Jose (1970)

	Dayton	San Jose
Total[1] number of persons victimized	16,310	28,290
Assault victims[2]	12,230	22,190
Robbery victims	3,180	4,890
Personal larceny victims	1,690	2,330
Women as a percent of:		
Assault victims[2]	31	34
Robbery victims	36	34
Personal larceny victims	49	30
Young men between 16 and 24 as a percent of:		
Assault victims[2]	40	32
Robbery victims	22	37
Personal larceny victims	19	33
Minority group members[3] as a percent of:		
Assault victims	13	10
Robbery victims	27	12
Personal larceny victims	26	7
Low-income area residents as a percent of:		
Assault victims[2]	13	13
Robbery victims	38	21
Personal larceny victims	31	18

[1]Numbers do not add to total because of persons who were victims of more than one type of crime.

[2]Includes persons who reported they were victims of rape.

[3]Dayton figures are for black persons; San Jose figures are for persons of Spanish origin or descent.

Table 9. Selected victimization rates for persons in Dayton and in San Jose (1970)

	Victimization Rates[1]	
	Dayton	San Jose
Persons victimized by:		
Assault[2]	3.2	3.3
Robbery	0.8	0.8
Personal larceny	0.4	0.3
Women victimized by:		
Assault[2]	1.9	2.1
Robbery	0.6	0.5
Personal larceny	0.4	0.2
Young men between 16 and 24 victimized by:		
Assault	11.7	9.2
Robbery	1.7	2.4
Personal larceny	0.8	1.0
Minority group members[3] victimized by:		
Assault[2]	3.1	3.9
Robbery	1.6	1.0
Personal larceny	0.8	0.3
Low-income area residents victimized by:		
Assault[2]	3.8	3.7
Robbery	2.9	1.3
Personal larceny	1.2	0.5

[1]Victimization rate: Number of persons per 100 population 16 and older who were victims of rape, assault, personal larceny, or robbery.
[2]Includes persons who reported that they were raped.
[3]Dayton figures are for black persons; San Jose figures are for persons of Spanish origin or descent.

and San Jose had never been married. In San Jose half as many were separated, widowed, or divorced; whereas in Dayton the proportion separated, widowed, or divorced was even smaller.

The age distribution of victims in San Jose was remarkably stable both by sex and by type of crime. For each type of crime young victims of both sexes predominated, and the number of victims fell off sharply for successively older age groups. In Dayton there was more diversity. Female victims were, on the average, older than male victims, and victims of robbery and personal larceny were older than victims of assault. For example, 60 percent of the victims of personal larceny and 50 percent of the robbery victims were more than 40 years old, whereas 50 percent of the assault victims were less than 25. In general, victims of crime in San Jose were likely to be less than 25, regardless of their sex or of the crime committed against them. Dayton victims were not likely to be so young unless they were male victims of assault or females assaulted by a relative or acquaintance.

Three-fifths of the crime victims in the Dayton metropolitan area lived inside the central city.[1] Only two-fifths of the San Jose area victims lived inside the central city, a reflection of the fact that San Jose has several large satellite cities to Dayton's one. In both cities virtually none of the suburban victims of crime lived in low-income areas, whereas a third of the central city dwellers lived in the poorer neighborhoods. In San Jose the probability of becoming a victim of crime was no greater for persons living in low-income areas than it was for persons living in other areas, but in Dayton residents of low-income areas were twice as likely to be victims of crime as residents of more prosperous areas.

In many ways the probability of being a victim of crime, or the victimization rate, is a more significant figure than the number of victims, because it describes both the victims and their relationship to the total population. For example, although only 10 percent of the victims in San Jose were Spanish Americans, their victimization rate, 5.2 percent, was just about the same as that for Anglos.[2] This simply means that although Spanish Americans represent a minority of the population in San Jose, they are no more or less likely to be victims of crime than the majority Anglo population. Similarly, blacks, who accounted for only 14 percent of the victim population in Dayton, had a victimization rate, 5.3 percent, that was only slightly higher than that for the white population.

The victimization rates for persons in Dayton and San Jose, like so many other aspects of their crime situations, were remarkably

[1]The residence of a victim of crime does not indicate where the crime occurred. Any crime which the victim did not report as occurring "in or around the home" could have occurred anywhere in the metropolitan area or even outside the metropolitan area.

[2]The term "Anglo" is used in this report to describe all white persons not of Spanish origin.

similar. In both cities, 4.2 percent of the population 16 years old and older were victims of a personal crime in 1970. In both cities men were twice as likely to be victims of crime than women, and the very young were much more likely to be victims of crime than the very old. In both cities persons married and living with their spouses were much less likely to be victims of crime than the unmarried or the separated, divorced, or widowed. The high rates for the unmarried are another manifestation of the rates for youth and young adults. In view of the extremely low rates for the elderly, the high victimization rates for the separated, divorced, or widowed probably reflect the situation for the separated and divorced more than for the widowed.

The exceptionally high victimization rates for younger persons and the high victimization rates for males both rest primarily on the tendency of youths and young men to be victims of assault, especially attempted assault by strangers. In contrast, young people in Dayton are no more likely to be robbed than persons older than 65 and no more likely to have their pockets picked than persons older than 40. The risk of robbery is a little over 1 in 100; for pocket picking, it is 1 in 200.

Women and older persons are often seen, and often see themselves, as particularly vulnerable to crime. Yet the information obtained in Dayton and San Jose indicates that their chances of being victimized are substantially less than for younger men. Without doubt there are circumstances under which women and elderly men are less able to defend themselves forcefully than a younger man. Consequently, they may avoid placing themselves in situations where such circumstances would be most likely to arise. For example, they may avoid being alone on the street in the late evening, a setting in which many assault incidents take place. On the other hand, youths and young men may feel that any effort to avoid potentially hazardous situations might appear to be an admission of lack of bravery. Furthermore, the behavior patterns and social habits of young men may produce a large number of situations especially conducive to the eruption of an assault incident. Whether some or all of these influences are at work, they indicate that the victimization rate for any segment of the population is the net effect of their vulnerability and the efforts they make to minimize that vulnerability.

MULTIPLE VICTIMIZATION

In the Dayton-San Jose pilot survey, information was collected on the number of persons who had been victims of crime on more than one occasion. The information was collected only for the crimes of burglary and assault.[3] Only 4 percent of the population had been victims of either of these crimes even once. Of those who had experienced robbery or assault at least once, 15 percent had been victimized a second time; and of those who had been victimized a second time, a full third had been victimized three or more times. It is clear that the chances of being victimized are much greater for those who have already been victims than for those who have never been victimized. In fact, the risk of being victimized again rises substantially with each subsequent victimization.

In San Jose the relative frequency of robbery and assault among two- and three-time victims remained about the same as for single-time victims. Of all the persons who were victims of either robbery or assault on a single occasion, four-fifths were assaulted. Of all the persons who were victimized twice, four-fifths were assaulted on the second occasion. The same relationship held for the third occasion as well. In Dayton, second- and third-time victims were somewhat more likely to be assaulted than first-time victims. Because the chances of being assaulted are about four times greater than being robbed at any time, the cumulative effect was that 98 percent of all the persons who were victimized on two or more occasions were assaulted at least once.

HOUSEHOLDS

In the Dayton-San Jose pilot study the convention was adopted that the household rather

[3]Because personal larceny was not included in the crimes for which information on multiple victimization was collected, the full extent to which persons in Dayton and San Jose were repeatedly victimized is somewhat understated.

than the individual would be considered the victim in all theft incidents except those where the object was taken directly from the person of the individual (personal larceny). As a consequence the rate of victimization for households in Dayton and San Jose was substantially higher than it would otherwise have been. In both cities 2 out of every 5 households experienced some form of property crime in 1970. Thirty percent of the households in Dayton and San Jose were victims of theft at some time during the year, but only a third of these incidents actually occurred in or around the home. More than 10 percent of the homes in Dayton and San Jose were burglarized during the year, and 2 percent were victims of auto theft.

Over half of the households victimized had annual incomes of $10,000 or more. In 60 percent of the households, the living quarters were occupied by the owner. Roughly 80 percent were located outside of the low-income areas of each city. In Dayton more than 15 percent of the households victimized were black; in San Jose less than 10 percent of the homes victimized were Spanish American. (See Tables 10 and 11.)

Burglary is the most serious form of property crime, because the safety and security of the home is violated through an act of illegal entry. In both Dayton and San Jose 1 household out of 8 was burglarized, but there were striking differences in the patterns of burglary in each city. These differences reflect, in turn, the fundamental difference in the character and composition of the two cities.

In Dayton 1 out of every 5 black families was burglarized in 1970. This victimization rate is more than twice that for white families. The difference results entirely from acts of forcible entry. Burglary by unlawful entry was no greater for blacks than for whites. Black families were the victims in a fourth of all burglaries in Dayton, but they were the victims in almost half of the burglaries in which the loss exceeded $500. Because blacks are concentrated almost exclusively in the central city, because they reside disproportionately in low-income areas, and because they are more likely to be renters than homeowners, the extremely high burglary rates for blacks contributed to the high victimization rates for each of the other categories as well.

Table 10. Selected characteristics of households victimized by crime in Dayton and in San Jose (1970)

	Dayton	San Jose
Total[1] number of households victimized:	68,830	128,190
Burglary victims	22,250	40,480
Larceny victims	53,290	102,990
Auto theft victims	4,330	6,360
Minority group households[2] as a percent of:		
Burglary victims	25	8
Larceny victims	16	7
Auto theft victims	23	13
Low-income area households as a percent of:		
Burglary victims	20	14
Larceny victims	12	10
Auto theft victims	16	18
Central-city households as a percent of:		
Burglary victims	59	44
Larceny victims	47	41
Auto theft victims	50	50

[1]Numbers do not add to total because of households that were victims of more than one type of crime.
[2]Dayton figures are for households headed by black persons; San Jose figures are for households headed by persons of Spanish origin or descent.

In view of this fact and in view of the fact that the median income for blacks in Dayton is substantially less than that of whites, one might assume that the burglary victimization risk for low-income families in Dayton is greater than for more affluent families. This is not the case. The victimization rates for households with incomes of less than $7,500 is the same as it is for households with incomes in excess of $10,000. This similarity suggests that Dayton burglars exercise some selectivity; that although they may choose a target within the inner-city ghetto, they choose among the more prosperous homes located there.

The black population of San Jose is, of course, extremely small. The larger Spanish population is not concentrated exclusively in any part of the city but is scattered throughout the metropolitan area. Consequently, the risk of burglary, though the same at the aggregate level as that of Dayton, is much more

Table 11. Selected victimization rates for households in Dayton and in San Jose (1970)

	Victimization rates[1]	
	Dayton	San Jose
Households victimized by:		
Burglary	12.2	12.5
Larceny	29.3	31.9
Auto theft	2.4	2.0
Minority group households[2] victimized by:		
Burglary	22.0	13.0
Larceny	32.8	29.6
Auto theft	3.9	3.1
Low-income area households victimized by:		
Burglary	20.3	14.8
Larceny	29.6	27.7
Auto theft	3.2	2.9
Central-city households victimized by:		
Burglary	15.6	13.6
Larceny	30.0	32.4
Auto theft	2.6	2.4

[1]Victimization rate: Number of households per 100 households that were victims of larceny, burglary, or auto theft.

[2]Dayton figures are for households headed by black persons; San Jose figures are for households headed by persons of Spanish origin or descent.

evenly shared by San Jose's various population groups. Whereas in Dayton 60 percent of all burglarized households were located inside the central city, in San Jose the same proportion was located outside the central city.

In San Jose there was a slight tendency for low-income area residents and renters to be burglarized more often than residents of other areas and homeowners, but these differences were not as great as they were for Dayton, even though a larger majority of low-income area residents are renters in San Jose than they are in Dayton. In San Jose, as in Dayton, the risk of burglary did not seem to be related to the household's income.

Because burglary is physically tied to the place of residence of the household victimized, it reflects the distinct individuality of Dayton and San Jose much more than auto theft and other larceny. In both Dayton and San Jose, auto theft was experienced somewhat more often by minority group members than by the rest of the population. Moreover, in each city low-income area residents were more likely to be victims of auto theft than others. Renters also had a significantly greater risk of auto theft than homeowners. Although this differential may be another manifestation of the higher rate for low-income area residents, it may also reflect the fact that renters are less likely to have an offstreet parking place of their own than homeowners are.

Larceny is by far the most heterogeneous of the three types of household crimes. Although the victimization patterns for larceny in Dayton and in San Jose do not differ significantly from one another, they do differ somewhat from the patterns for robbery and auto theft. Because of the variety of crimes grouped together as household larceny, the significance of these differences is not clear. For example, the risk of larceny does not vary by minority group status, areas of residence, or homeownership. Larceny is, however, the only household crime for which the risk varies by income; upper-income households are more likely to be victims than lower-income families. However, the differential risk is greater for petty larceny than it is for grand larceny. In other words, although a higher-income household is more likely to have something stolen from the home or from a household member than a low-income household is, the difference in likelihood is even greater when the goods stolen are worth no more than $50.

VICTIM REPORTING OF CRIMES

The Dayton-San Jose pilot survey collected information not only on whether or not a criminal event had occurred, but also on whether or not the event had been reported to the police. The source of this information was the victim himself and not police records.[4]

[4]In order to distinguish information on crime reported to the police that is obtained from the victim from information on crime reported to the police that is obtained from police records, the former is referred to herein as "reported crime" and the latter as "recorded crime." "Unreported crime" is that crime about which the victim stated that the police were not informed.

For many years the principal source of information on crime, and the only comprehensive source of information at the national level, was compilations from police records. The FBI *Uniform Crime Reports* have made this information available to the public annually since 1930. Although the *Uniform Crime Reports* have been of great value to those in the criminal justice field, it has always been recognized that the amount of crime of which the police are aware must inevitably be an understatement of the total amount of crime that actually occurred. In the Dayton-San Jose pilot survey, not only total crime, but also crime that the victims said had been reported to the police, exceeded that for which the police had records.[5]

Half of the crimes committed in both Dayton and San Jose in 1970 were not reported to the police. However, both the composition of the unreported crimes and the reasons given by victims for not reporting them indicate that, on the whole, the unreported crimes were much less serious than the reported crimes. More than half of the unreported crimes were larcenies of less than $50; rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary of commercial establishments, and auto theft, all combined, represented only 5 percent of the unreported crimes in both Dayton and San Jose. (See Table 12.)

In both cities the principal reasons given for not reporting a crime were that it was not important enough or that no harm had been done. (See Table 12.) A third of the victims in Dayton and two-fifths of the victims in San Jose gave one of these responses. Another 25 percent in both cities felt that nothing could have been accomplished by reporting the crime, because there was a lack of evidence or a lack of proof. Only 5 percent of the victims in each city said they did not report the incident because the police would be unresponsive or unconcerned. The same proportion said they did not report the incident because they felt it was a private or a personal matter. The similarity in the types of crimes that were not reported in the two cities suggests that there is considerable agreement among victims on the relative importance of various criminal incidents.

Table 12. Citizens' reasons for not reporting incidents to the police

	Dayton	San Jose
Total reasons	100 percent	100 percent
Not important enough	26	31
No material loss or physical harm suffered	9	11
Nothing could be done/lack of evidence or proof	26	28
Private/personal matter	4	5
Police would not do anything/ police would not want to be bothered	6	5
Inconvenient	3	4
Did not want to harm offender	2	2
Victim's fault	1	1
Fear of reprisal	1	1
Did not think of it	2	1
Don't know why	7	3
Other reason given	13	8

[5]For a discussion of the differences between reported crime and recorded crime, see Appendix I, "The Pilot Survey and Other Crime Statistics."

V

THE OFFENDERS

No data collected in the surveys of Dayton and San Jose pose such hazards to interpretation as the characteristics of the offenders. Offender characteristics are, of course, entirely dependent on the accurate observation and recollection of the victim. The victim, however, is reporting a situation of personal stress that may have happened as long as a year before, frequently after dark, and usually involving a stranger. Under such circumstances it is highly unlikely that the reported observations are consistently accurate; but it is likely that, when inaccurate, they tend to conform to the victim's preconceptions. If, for example, a victim thinks that most crime is committed by minority group members or by teenagers, he may resolve any doubts he has concerning the characteristics of his offender in favor of his bias.

Information on the characteristics of offenders was obtained from the victim for the crimes of assault, personal robbery, and personal larceny. Of these three crimes, assault is so much more frequent than the other two that an examination of the characteristics of all offenders becomes primarily an examination of the characteristics of assailants.

As reported by their victims, more than half of all crimes were committed by male offenders acting alone. Another third were committed by males acting in groups. Less than 10 percent were by females acting alone. All of the other possibilities—groups of females, groups composed of both sexes, and cases where the sex of the offender was not known to the victim—comprised less than 10 percent of the total incidents reported by the victims.

In both cities victims who reported that they were attacked by a lone offender judged the offender to be younger than 21 in a third of the cases. Victims who reported that they were attacked by a group judged all the group members to be less than 21 considerably more often than they judged all group members to be more than 21. In a fourth of the cases where victims were attacked by more than one offender, the victims were unable to specify the ages of the offenders or believed that some were older and some were younger than 21.

The racial and ethnic identity of offenders is particularly susceptible to misreporting, because for many people the subject has a high emotional content. Victims of crime in Dayton, in naming their assailants, had to decide primarily between blacks and whites, almost none of whom were of Spanish descent. In San Jose, the choice was more complicated; the victim had to decide whether the offender was Anglo, Spanish American, black, or oriental. Consequently, twice as many victims in San Jose as in Dayton acknowledged that they didn't know the racial or ethnic identity of their offender. Nevertheless, in both cities the majority of the offenders were judged to be white (Anglo) males. Minority group members were reported as the offenders more often when the victim was attacked by a group than

when he was attacked by a lone assailant. Groups of offenders were rarely reported to be racially or ethnically mixed.

Although it would be extremely useful to examine the characteristics of offenders according to the characteristics of their victims, it is not possible to do so in surveys the size of those conducted in Dayton and San Jose. Even so, it is clear that victims and offenders in Dayton and San Jose share some traits in common. They are both quite likely to be lone young white (Anglo) males.

VI

COMMUNITY ATTITUDES

The extent of crime and the type of crime experienced in Dayton and San Jose, as has been pointed out, were remarkably similar. The reactions of the citizens of these two places to the crime in their midst were quite different. On the whole, residents of Dayton did not feel as safe as the residents of San Jose, and were more likely to feel personally vulnerable to crime and to have modified their behavior and activities out of concern about crime. They were also less likely to be satisfied with the performance of the police in their city. The individuality of the two cities was also apparent in the attitudes of their various racial and ethnic groups. Blacks in Dayton were much more concerned about crime than whites. In San Jose, however, the majority Anglos showed more concern than minority group members, although the difference was not as dramatic as the difference in Dayton. (See Table 13.)

The greater concern with crime of the black population in Dayton was expressed in several ways. For example, more than 25 percent of the blacks in Dayton felt very unsafe when they were out alone in their own neighborhoods at night, and 40 percent had limited or changed their activities because they were concerned about crime. White citizens in Dayton were only half as likely to feel unsafe or act in the same way. One out of every five black citizens of Dayton felt that the police were doing a poor job, a rate of dissatisfaction four times that of whites.

The differences in concern about crime between the black and white population of Dayton appear to be greater than the differences in victimization. For crimes against persons such as assault and robbery, the victimization rate for Dayton's blacks is not significantly higher than for whites. Only property crimes and, in particular, burglary, befell blacks substantially more frequently than whites.

A somewhat similar discrepancy between the risk of crime, as measured by victimization rates, and concern about crime existed in San Jose. Anglos felt about as safe in their own neighborhoods as Spanish Americans, oriental Americans, or blacks; only 1 out of 10 felt very unsafe alone at night. Yet Anglos were considerably more likely to feel that their chances of being personally robbed or attacked had increased than were minority group members. They were also somewhat likely to feel that crime had increased in their neighborhood and to have modified their activities because of crime. Nevertheless, they were more likely to feel that the police were doing a good job.

There is very little racial or ethnic difference in the victimization rates for either personal or property crimes in San Jose. However, when there is a difference, it is clearly to the advantage of the majority Anglo population. The Anglo population appears to be somewhat more apprehensive than the minority population, however, even though their vulnerability is somewhat less.

Table 13. Attitudes and opinions about crime and the police in Dayton and in San Jose by race/ethnic origin, area of residence, age, and sex

Race/ethnic origin, sex, age, and area of residence	Percent of population[1] who:				
	Think crime increased	Feel chances of being attacked or robbed have gone up	Feel very unsafe alone at night in own neighborhood	Have limited or changed activities because of crime	Said police were doing a poor job
Race/ethnic origin:					
Dayton					
Total	38.8	73.9	13.8	22.4	7.0
White	37.5	73.6	11.8	19.7	5.1
Black	47.8	77.4	27.2	39.8	19.5
San Jose					
Total	30.9	66.8	9.8	22.8	5.1
Anglo	31.5	69.1	10.0	23.3	4.7
Spanish	26.8	52.5	9.0	20.1	8.4
Black	28.7	53.4	9.5	20.1	6.3
Oriental	28.0	58.1	7.7	19.2	4.8
Sex:					
Dayton	38.8	73.9	13.8	22.4	7.0
Male	37.4	73.1	6.4	17.9	7.2
Female	40.1	74.7	20.4	26.4	6.7
San Jose	30.9	66.8	9.8	22.8	5.1
Male	30.8	63.5	2.8	17.5	6.2
Female	30.9	69.8	16.2	27.5	4.2
Age:					
Dayton					
16-24 years	37.8	66.4	10.6	15.7	9.8
25-39 years	39.1	78.1	19.2	22.8	7.3
40-64 years	40.9	77.7	15.2	25.5	5.8
65 years or older	33.1	65.5	26.2	23.9	4.4
San Jose					
16-24 years	29.2	58.9	9.2	19.3	7.6
25-39 years	32.7	70.5	8.2	23.2	5.2
40-64 years	31.2	71.4	10.3	24.4	4.2
65 years or older	26.7	55.4	16.2	23.6	1.8
Area of residence:					
Dayton	38.8	73.9	13.8	22.4	7.0
Low-income areas	47.7	74.1	31.9	37.9	19.1
Other areas	37.7	73.9	11.5	20.4	5.4
San Jose	30.9	66.8	9.8	22.8	5.1
Low-income areas	32.7	62.5	21.4	30.1	6.8
Other areas	30.6	67.3	8.3	21.8	4.9

[1]Population 16 years old and older.

In both Dayton and San Jose, persons living in poor neighborhoods were more likely to be concerned about crime and to disapprove of the police than residents of other areas. In Dayton, however, the differences between low-income area residents and others were much sharper and reflected the high concentration of blacks in those areas.

Attitudes about crime differed according to the age and sex of the individual. The pattern was similar for both cities, but in Dayton the age-sex differences were somewhat greater. In both cities women were more concerned about crime than men, and older persons were more concerned than younger ones. In both cities the variation by age was greater

than the variation by sex. Here too, the extent of concern runs counter to the extent of victimization, as young men are so much more likely to be the targets of crime than women or older men. It may be, however, that those most concerned about crime take greater precautions and consequently reduce the likelihood of their becoming victims. Women of all ages and men older than 25 were more likely to have modified their activities because of crime.

The attitudes of the citizens of Dayton and San Jose about crime are frequently at variance with the probabilities of crime. This is true both within each city and for each city with respect to the other. On the whole, the citizens of Dayton are more concerned about crime than the citizens of San Jose. Conversely the citizens of San Jose are less concerned about crime than the citizens of Dayton. The question of how much concern is merited by how much crime is obviously conjectural.

It is clear, however, that given the two cities' strikingly similar experience with crime during 1970, attitudes in these cities have been shaped to a large extent by other influences. These influences, no doubt numerous and countervailing, include, in part, the degree of racial or ethnic tension within the community; the treatment of crime in the communications media; community assessment of the effectiveness, not only of the police, but also of the entire local governmental structure; and the extent to which the community feels itself to be generally law abiding. These forces are well beyond the purview of victimization surveys. Victimization surveys can, however, provide individuals with an independent measure of the extent of crime against which they can test their own preconceptions.

APPENDIX I

STATISTICAL DESIGN, PROCEDURES, AND DATA LIMITATIONS

The Dayton-San Jose Pilot Survey of Victimization, conducted during January and February of 1971, was the first joint effort by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) and the Bureau of the Census to apply their victimological research methods to a general population sample. Before this survey was undertaken, several smaller-scale validation studies had been completed. The principal overall purpose of the validation studies was to develop the survey instruments through alternative questionnaire designs administered to known crime victims selected from police offense reports. Therefore, a major technical purpose of the Dayton-San Jose survey was to test the survey instruments on a sample of the general population. (Further discussion about other methodological considerations follows in this appendix, and the survey instruments are discussed in Appendix II.)

SAMPLE DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION

The survey universe consisted of the urbanized areas of Santa Clara County, California, and Montgomery County, Ohio; the data therefore cover not only the central cities of Dayton and San Jose but also the surrounding highly urban territory. Personal interviews were used for a probability sample of approximately 5,500 households and more than 1,000 businesses in each of the two areas. Field interviewing was carried out simultaneously in both areas.

The overall statistical design of the program called for (a) determining the incidence and character of personal and household victimization from a sample of adults (16 and older) living in housing units and in group quarters and (b) determining the incidence and character of commercial robbery and burglary from a sample of business establishments and other organizational units. The victimization data refer to calendar year 1970.

The design of the program consequently involved separate collection procedures in the household and the commercial sectors.

In the household sector, the housing units selected for the Dayton-San Jose survey were located in the 1970 Decennial Census Address Coding Guide areas of the Montgomery County portion of the Dayton, Ohio, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) and the San Jose, California, SMSA. The Address Coding Guide area created for each of these SMSA's corresponds to the city delivery area of the postal service. Approximately 95 percent of the population in both SMSA's is included in the Address Coding Guide area.

Approximately 5,500 households (including group quarters units) were designated for interview in each of these areas. Two geographic strata were designated for sampling purposes in each area. Thus about 20 percent of the

sample households were designated in a low-income stratum (formerly called a poverty area); the remaining 80 percent were located in the balance of the Address Coding Guide area. The group of 1970 Decennial Census tracts defined by the Population Division of the Bureau of the Census as the low-income area constituted the low-income stratum. Because 1970 census data were not available for selecting pilot survey low-income areas, the areas were delineated through a research program utilizing available information from a wide variety of sources to redefine low-income areas, which were previously selected on the basis of 1960 Decennial Census data. In Dayton and San Jose, these tracts were, for the most part, geographically contiguous and contained about 13 percent of the population in each area.

In the household sector, an experiment in study design tested two types of respondent methods to determine which to use in future surveys of this kind. Before the interviewing, the sample households were divided equally into two groups: in one, "household respondents" would be asked to report for themselves and all other household members 16 and older; in the other, each qualified household member would be interviewed individually. For those households receiving the self-respondent treatment, an attitude supplement was administered along with the basic victimization questionnaire. Of the 5,500 households designated for interview in each area, approximately 3 percent in San Jose and 5 percent in Dayton were not interviewed, because the occupants were not found at home after repeated calls or were unavailable for other reasons. An additional 3 percent of the persons in self-respondent households were not interviewed for the same reasons. A further 7 to 8 percent of the designated households were not available for survey purposes because the sample unit was vacant or demolished.

The commercial portion of the survey was based on an area sample made up of businesses located in specific small land areas or segments. An interviewer visited every recognizable business in the designated segments and obtained information for this survey by personal interview. The survey included all retail, wholesale, service, manufacturing, and other business establishments, including construction, real estate, finance, credit, and agricultural service establishments. Federal, State, and local government activities were excluded. Banks were also excluded, but credit unions, small loan companies, and savings and loan associations were included. Businesses involved in agricultural production, such as farms, ranches, and dairies, were excluded; but those having a business location or office from which agricultural services such as nursery, greenhouse, and veterinarian services were provided were included. Realty firms and large apartment houses were included, but small buildings with fewer than five units were not canvassed.

In conjunction with the household survey about 100 nonrecognizable businesses operated in homes were identified and included in the survey of commercial business establishments. The total sample included about 1,300 businesses in San Jose, California, of which about 5 percent were not interviewed, and about 1,100 businesses in Dayton, Ohio, of which about 10 percent were not interviewed.

ESTIMATION PROCEDURES

The data in this report are based upon the combined results of the two experimental procedures tested: the "household respondent" method and the "self-respondent" method. A first step in the estimation procedure used in the household survey was to inflate the sample data for each household by the reciprocal of its probability of selection. Because two types of interviewing procedures were used to collect data, one adjustment was made to account for persons not interviewed in self-respondent households, and another was made to account for households in which no one was interviewed. A final step in preparing the estimates was a ratio estimation procedure that adjusted the distribution of the sample population in 16 age, sex, and race cells to the corresponding 1970 Census distribution by poverty area, balance of central city, and the balance of the sample area. The ratio estimation procedure was used to produce estimates of crimes against persons

(i.e., persons victimized, personal incidents, etc.).

As part of the estimation procedure for personal crimes, the count of incidents was adjusted to reflect the multiple probability of inclusion for incidents with two or more victims.

Estimates of crimes against households were obtained by using the final inflation factor (or weight) assigned to the household head as a result of the above procedure, except for husband-wife households, for which the weight assigned to the wife was used. Experience has shown that the estimates obtained for husband-wife households using this procedure are more stable than those using the weight of the household head.

For the commercial sector of the survey, the estimation procedure was to inflate the sample cases by the reciprocal of their probabilities of selection with an appropriate adjustment for business where no interview was obtained.

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE ESTIMATES

One of the sources of error in this survey is sampling variation, arising because a sample of the population was surveyed, as opposed to a complete census of the entire population.

The sample used for this survey is only one of a large number of possible samples of the same size that could have been selected. Estimates derived from different samples would differ from each other. The standard error of a survey estimate measures the variation among the estimates from all possible samples—and also, therefore, measures the precision with which an estimate from a particular sample approximates the result of a complete census using the same collection procedures. The chances are about 2 out of 3 that the survey estimate will differ from the true value (the value that a complete census would have produced) by less than one standard error (plus or minus). Similarly, the chances are about 19 out of 20 that the difference would be less than twice the standard error and 99 out of 100 that it would be less than 2 1/2 times the standard error.

In addition to sampling error, the survey estimates are subject to nonsampling errors. The major sources of nonsampling error in this survey are incorrect reporting (especially by household respondents) of victimization experiences during a 12-month period (January through December 1970 for this survey). Because of these reporting errors, the data may include incidents that occurred before the reference period and exclude incidents that actually occurred during the reference period. Such recall errors have been documented in Statistics Technical Report No. 1, "San Jose Methods Test of Known Crime Victims," an LEAA publication. Other sources of nonsampling error result from incomplete response, systematic data errors introduced by the interviewer, and mistakes in coding and processing the data. Such errors would also occur in a complete census.

The standard errors computed for the household survey are rough approximations and suggest the order of magnitude of the standard errors rather than the precise value for a specific item. Table 1 contains the standard errors applicable to the number of persons victimized, the number not victimized, or the number of personal incidents. Table 2 shows the standard errors applicable to personal victimization rates and to other percentages as estimated from this survey where the bases of the percentages are persons or personal crimes. Similarly, Table 3 contains the standard errors applicable to number of households victimized and not victimized and to the number of household incidents; and Table 4 shows the standard errors applicable to household victimization rates and other percentages where the bases of the percentages are household crimes. The standard errors presented in these tables may be used for estimates obtained from either the Dayton or the San Jose area. As indicated in Tables 2 and 4, the standard error of a percentage computed using sample data in both the numerator and denominator depends on the size of the percentage and the size of the total upon which the percentage is based.

For a difference between two sample estimates, the standard error is approximately equal to the square root of the sum of the squares of the standard errors of each estimate considered separately. This formula will represent the actual standard error quite accurately for the difference between two estimates of the same characteristic in two different areas, or for the difference between separate and uncorrelated characteristics in the same area. If, however, there is a high positive correlation between the two characteristics, the formula will overestimate the true standard error.

In the commercial sector, a host of sampling errors has been estimated for a number of business characteristics. No attempt was made to generalize the sampling errors, as was done for the household sector; rather the following tables present actual estimated standard errors for some of the more important characteristics measured in the survey. The standard errors presented in Tables 5-7 were based on estimates obtained from the Dayton area, and the standard errors in Tables 8-10 were computed for the San Jose area.

Table 1. Standard errors of estimated numbers of persons 16 or older

(68 chances out of 100)

Size of estimate	Standard error
250	150
500	200
1,000	300
2,500	500
5,000	700
10,000	1,000
25,000	1,500
50,000	2,100
100,000	2,900
250,000	4,200
500,000	4,900
700,000	4,500

METHODOLOGICAL RESULTS

This survey was the first attempt to try out on a general population sample the survey methods developed in smaller studies. The basic methodological objectives of the Dayton-San Jose survey were:

- to examine varying respondent techniques,
- to determine the degree of cooperation of a general sample of people in a survey of this type,
- to pilot-test a questionnaire pertaining to citizen attitudes about crime and the fear of crime, and
- to examine the problem of the optimum length of the recall period through use of a general sample. In addition, there was some experimenting with telephone interviews

One of the most significant technical features examined in this survey was the question of who makes the most valid respondent for personal crimes: each household member responding for himself (self-respondent) or a

Table 2. Standard errors of estimated percentages of persons 16 or older

(68 chances out of 100)

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage					
	1 or 99	2 or 98	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	50
250	6.1	8.6	13.5	18.5	26.8	30.9
500	4.3	6.1	9.5	13.1	18.9	21.8
1,000	3.1	4.3	6.7	9.3	13.4	15.4
2,500	1.9	2.7	4.2	5.8	8.4	9.7
5,000	1.4	1.9	3.0	4.1	5.9	6.9
10,000	1.0	1.4	2.1	2.9	4.2	4.9
25,000	.6	.9	1.3	1.8	2.7	3.1
50,000	.4	.6	.9	1.3	1.9	2.2
100,000	.3	.4	.7	.9	1.3	1.5
250,000	.2	.3	.4	.6	.8	1.0
500,000	.1	.2	.3	.4	.6	.7
700,000	.1	.2	.3	.3	.5	.6

Table 3. Standard errors of estimated numbers of households (68 chances out of 100)

Size of estimate	Standard error
250	150
500	200
1,000	300
2,500	500
5,000	650
10,000	900
25,000	1,400
50,000	1,850
100,000	2,500
250,000	2,200

chance respondent in each household responding for all members of the household (household respondent).

A controlled experiment was designed into the survey to answer this question. A split-sample approach was used in which a random half of the 11,000 designated sample households in Dayton and San Jose combined were given the self-respondent treatment, and the remaining random half-sample was given the household respondent treatment. The results, shown in Table 11, reveal a substantially greater reporting of incidents with the self-respondent method. The pattern is consistent for each type of crime, though the magnitude of the ratio varies.

Another important technical feature of the survey was examining the length of the recall period. The effects of the choice of the reference period on recall have been documented fairly extensively from LEAA/Bureau of the Census reverse record checks, (i.e., studies comparing survey-derived information with police offense reports, where the sample unit is the named victim in police files.) A general principle that can be inferred from these recall studies is that the accuracy of survey-derived incidence data increases as the length of the recall period decreases. In other words, asking respondents to report incidents a day old produces less bias from memory failure than asking them to report incidents a week old. Memory bias, however, is not the only design parameter to consider in choosing an optimum reference period. Sample size plays a major role, as well. For example, the longer the recall period used, the smaller the sample size required to produce data at a given degree of reliability. Thus, whereas sampling errors decrease with an increasing length of reference period, nonsampling errors (in the form of respondent memory failure) increase.

As a result of these considerations, that is, balancing cost against precision and accuracy, and in view of future LEAA/Bureau of the Census victimization surveys, the reference period was narrowed to a choice between 6 months and 12 months. Respondents were asked to report the month in which each victimization took place. Results were tabulated (see Table 12), comparing the estimated number of incidents for the first 6 months of 1970

Table 4. Standard errors of estimated percentages of households (68 chances out of 100)

Base of percentage	Estimated percentage					
	2 or 98	5 or 95	10 or 90	25 or 75	35 or 65	50
250	8.2	12.7	17.5	25.3	27.8	29.2
500	5.8	9.0	12.4	17.9	20.0	20.6
1,000	4.1	6.4	8.7	12.6	13.9	14.6
2,500	2.5	4.0	5.5	7.9	8.7	9.1
5,000	1.8	2.8	3.9	5.6	6.1	6.4
10,000	1.3	2.0	2.7	3.9	4.3	4.6
25,000	.8	1.3	1.7	2.5	2.7	2.9
50,000	.6	.9	1.2	1.8	1.9	2.0
100,000	.4	.6	.9	1.2	1.4	1.4
250,000	.3	.4	.5	.8	.9	.9
325,000	.2	.3	.5	.7	.8	.8

Table 5. Standard errors of estimated numbers of businesses in Dayton

(68 chances out of 100)

Characteristic	Size of estimate	Standard error
All businesses with burglary or robbery	4,130	1,020
Retail/wholesale business burglary	1,516	370
Retail/wholesale business robbery	237	90
Burglary of business with:		
No paid employees	330	90
20 or more paid employees	566	210
Receipts of $1 million or more	347	140
Receipts of less than $10,000	293	80
Location inside city	1,773	380
Location inside city's low-income area	786	260

with the estimated number of incidents for the last 6 months.

Independent evidence suggests that there is very little seasonal variation between the two halves of a calendar year. The survey figures, however, show a dramatic difference between the estimates by time of year reported. This pattern persists for both self-respondents and household respondents, though the disparity is greater for the latter. These figures reflect the joint effect of greater memory fading in

Table 6. Standard errors of estimated percentages of businesses in Dayton

(68 chances out of 100)

Characteristic	Size of estimate (percent)	Standard error
All businesses with burglary or robbery	21.9	2.2
Retail/wholesale business burglary	23.2	3.9
Retail/wholesale business robbery	3.6	1.7
Burglary of business with:		
No paid employees	8.9	2.4
20 or more paid employees	25.2	4.1
Receipts of $1 million or more	21.1	3.1
Receipts of less than $10,000	10.3	2.7
Location inside city	25.0	5.6
Location inside city's low-income area	23.5	9.7

Table 7. Standard errors of estimated numbers of incidents in Dayton businesses

(68 chances out of 100)

Characteristic	Size of estimate	Standard error
All businesses with burglary or robbery	7,290	2,140
Retail/wholesale business burglary	2,613	680
Retail/wholesale business robbery	274	100
Burglary of business with:		
No paid employees	476	160
20 or more paid employees	1,279	720
Receipts of $1 million or more	512	220
Receipts of less than $10,000	458	150
Location inside city	2,997	600
Location inside city's low-income area	1,425	450

Table 8. Standard errors of estimated number of businesses in San Jose

(68 chances out of 100)

Characteristic	Size of estimate	Standard error
All businesses with burglary or robbery	4,780	890
Retail/wholesale business burglary	2,381	410
Retail/wholesale business robbery	473	110
Burglary of business with:		
No paid employees	683	170
20 or more paid employees	490	110
Receipts of $1 million or more	368	100
Receipts of less than $10,000	613	160
Location inside city	733	740
Location inside city's low-income area	366	690

Table 9. Standard errors of estimated percentages of businesses in San Jose

(68 chances out of 100)

Characteristic	Size of estimate (percent)	Standard error
All businesses with burglary or robbery	19.4	2.6
Retail/wholesale business burglary	29.2	3.9
Retail/wholesale business robbery	5.8	1.9
Burglary of business with:		
No paid employees	9.3	3.1
20 or more paid employees	29.5	5.4
Receipts of $1 million or more	28.0	6.8
Receipts of less than $10,000	9.6	3.2
Location inside city	20.1	4.3
Location inside city's low-income area	22.9	6.2

the earlier months and telescoping of incidents from the first 6-month period into the second 6-month period.

Table 10. Standard errors of estimated numbers of incidents in San Jose businesses

(68 chances out of 100)

Characteristics	Size of estimate	Standard error
All businesses with burglary or robbery	8,737	1,810
Retail/wholesale business burglary	4,518	1,080
Retail/wholesale business robbery	613	140
Burglary of business with:		
No paid employees	1,208	360
20 or more paid employees	1,121	340
Receipts of $1 million or more	928	320
Receipts of less than $10,000	946	240
Location inside city	3,204	1,550
Location inside city's low-income area	2,679	1,510

Table 11. Estimates of 1970 incidents by respondent method, Dayton and San Jose combined

Type of incident	Respondent techniques		
	Self	Household	Ratio of self to household
Strong-arm robbery	1,307	621	2.10
Armed robbery	994	845	1.18
Robbery attempts	2,140	974	2.20
Aggravated assault	2,273	1,489	1.53
Simple assault	6,094	4,928	1.24
Attempted assault	12,441	7,195	1.73
Rape and attempted rape	484	399	1.21

THE PILOT SURVEY AND OTHER CRIME STATISTICS

It is likely that the data in this report will be compared with data from various other sources. The reader should, however, be cautioned concerning some of the important differences between these and other crime data.

The Uniform Crime Reports

The best-known independent source of crime statistics is the *Uniform Crime Reports (UCR)*, published annually by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The classification of crime incidents in the victimization survey was based on the elements characterizing each crime incident. This classification makes it possible to categorize criminal events in terms of the context of motivation and behaviorism as well as to adhere to the definitions used by police agencies for reporting incidents to the FBI for the *UCR*. (cf. the *Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook).*

Substantial differences in coverage remain, nevertheless. The largest difference arises from the fact that police statistics on crime incidence are derived from reports that citizens make to the police, whereas the survey data include victimizations not reported to police as well as those reported. It should be noted also that according to the survey, many more crimes are

Table 12. Estimates of 1970 incidents by respondent method by when occurring — Dayton and San Jose combined

Type of incident	Respondent technique and time of occurrence					
	Self-respondent			Household respondent		
	First 6 months of 1970	Last 6 months of 1970	Ratio of last 6 to first 6	First 6 months of 1970	Last 6 months of 1970	Ratio of last 6 to first 6
Strong-arm robbery	544	762	1.40	210	410	1.95
Armed robbery	438	556	1.27	218	627	2.88
Robbery attempts	957	1,184	1.24	408	567	1.39
Aggravated assault	1,066	1,207	1.13	808	681	.84
Simple assault	2,688	3,406	1.27	2,190	2,738	1.25
Attempted assault	4,892	7,549	1.54	2,689	4,507	1.68
Rape and attempted rape	86	394	4.35	67	332	4.95

reported to the police than are, in turn, reported in police statistics. There could be a number of reasons for this discrepancy, including survey response errors, classification by the police of events as crimes not covered in this survey, recording by the police of fewer events than are reported to them, and so forth. In addition, the survey estimates of commercial larceny do not include shoplifting and employee theft—two types of inventory shrinkage that survey methodology is not yet advanced enough to measure. Finally, the personal crimes covered in the survey relate to persons who are 16 or older; to the extent that persons younger than 16 are victimized by assaultive violence or personal theft, the results do not parallel agency statistics.

Other survey-derived victimization data, such as the studies conducted for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, established in 1965, are not directly comparable to the results presented in this publication. Both the commission-sponsored studies and the current survey were experimental in several basic but different ways, such as questionnaire wording and format and respondent procedures.

The National Crime Panel

As a result of the Dayton-San Jose survey findings, a number of methodological refinements are being made in the statistical procedures of the National Crime Panel (NCP). Therefore, comparisons between data in this report and those forthcoming from the NCP should be made with caution, also.

Basically, the NCP uses a nationwide sample of individuals, households, and businesses representative of the country as a whole. The same sample is interviewed twice a year about experiences with crime in the period since the last interview. The data are aggregated and published four times a year. This statistically sophisticated approach provides a reliable empirical measure of changes in the extent and nature of crimes of theft and violence. As an adjunct to this nationwide quarterly report, separate reports will be published for the central city in 13 major metropolitan centers each year, reporting on at least 26 major cities in the first two years of reports.

Though the Dayton-San Jose report is in many respects prototypical of reports to be issued in connection with the National Crime Panel, there are several major differences between the two. Some of the more important differences are presented here.

1. The National Crime Panel (NCP) data are collected using the self-respondent technique entirely. The Dayton-San Jose project used a household-respondent method in half the survey units, which resulted in understating the incidence of crime.

2. The personal survey universe for the NCP is persons 12 or older. In the Dayton-San Jose study the universe consisted of persons 16 and older.

3. The basic unit of analysis for socioeconomic distributions and the associated rates of victimization in the NCP is the victim, rather than persons victimized one or more times. A person (or household) can be a victim several times in a given period of time; consequently there are more victims than there are persons (or households) victimized. The rates of victimization will be correspondingly higher in NCP reports than in the Dayton-San Jose survey. Also, counts of victims in each of the crime categories are additive, unlike counts of persons victimized one or more times. (See the Glossary for a discussion of the concept of multiple victimization.)

4. The crime classification categories for the NCP have been modified from those used in this report to reflect more precisely the multiple-offense nature of criminal victimization. For example, robbery often is accompanied by physical assault on the victim, just as forcible rape sometimes is committed in conjunction with a theft. Therefore, more descriptive categories are used in the NCP, such as "assaultive violence with theft," "robbery without assault," "rape with theft," etc. These categories are delineated with enough detail, however, so that they can easily be recombined to conform to the legal labels for events and to the traditional crime statistics categories used by the FBI in its *Uniform Crime Reports.*

For the Dayton-San Jose survey, robberies committed with or without assault are so labeled (see the detailed data tables in Appendix III). When rape and robbery were simultaneously committed upon the same victim, however, the event was categorized as a rape. The impact of this procedure on the Dayton-San Jose results is trivial, however, because of the inconsequential number of such cases in the survey.

5. For Dayton-San Jose the household, rather than the person, was designated as the victim of noncommercial larceny events, irrespective of where the victimization took place or who was actually affected. This designation meant that household crimes included not only those larcenies occurring at home, but also such "personal" victimizations as the theft of personal belongings from school or athletic lockers, restaurant coat rooms, one's office, and so forth. For the NCP these personal larceny events are ascribed to the person actually victimized, so that his relevant demographic characteristics can be analyzed. Household larcenies—those actually occurring at home—will be counted as household crimes. With this procedure, the household victimization rates for the NCP will be decidedly lower than if the Dayton-San Jose procedure were used; but personal victimization rates will not be correspondingly higher.

6. In the NCP, banks and government-owned liquor stores are included in the universe of establishments for which commercial robbery and burglary are ascertained. These were excluded from the Dayton-San Jose survey, although the statistical impact on the survey estimates was not significant.

7. A major procedural difference between the NCP and the Dayton-San Jose survey is the questionnaire format. The latter survey utilized multiple forms in the household sector and the commercial sector. In the household sector, a "screener" was used along with separate incident forms for personal crimes and for property crimes. In the commercial sector, a screener was also employed, with separate incident sheets for robbery and for burglary. (See Appendix II for a full description and exhibits of the survey instruments.)

For the NCP a single questionnaire is in use for the household and commercial sectors; all the pertinent information for a given respondent is recorded on a single form. It is not expected that this changeover will have any important substantive effect. Quality control is improved, however, not only with greater ease of administration by interviewers in the field, but also in the subsequent handling of survey forms in office processing.

APPENDIX II

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Two versions of the basic Dayton-San Jose survey questionnaire were designed for the household sample: Form SVC-1 (see Illustration 1), for households where any responsible adult provided information for all household members 16 and older, and Form SVC-1A (see Illustration 2), for households where each member 16 or older was interviewed for himself. The two forms were necessary to carry out the methodological test to determine the appropriate respondent. Although the format of the two varied slightly, the major difference was the inclusion of a set of household and individual attitude questions on Form SVC-1A for self-respondents. The household attitude questions were asked of the first person interviewed, and the individual attitude questions were asked of each eligible household member.

Both forms sought basic information on characteristics of the household members. Both forms also contained a battery of questions developed to screen for all instances of victimization before details of any specific incident were collected. Seven household screening questions dealing with crimes against property were asked only once in a household, since they pertained to the entire household. The set of individual screening questions elicited information on both personal and property crimes committed against each household member 16 or older.

Once the screening phase was completed in a household, the interviewer obtained the details of each reported incident, if there were any. Two different forms were used to collect the details of an incident: one for personal crimes, Form SVC-2 (see Illustration 3), and one for property crimes, Form SVC-3 (see Illustration 4). Each screening question identified the appropriate form to be filled out if an incident were mentioned.

Both incident report forms included such basic information as the time and place of occurrence, the economic loss incurred, reports to the police and other authorities, and related details. In addition, Form SVC-2 (Personal Crime Incident Report) included information on possible injuries to the victim, time lost from work, and the characteristics of the offender as perceived by the victim.

In households designated for Form SVC-1 (household respondent), the initial respondent answered first the household characteristic questions, next the household screening questions, then the individual screening questions for each eligible member, and last, any resulting incident report forms. In the remaining households using Form SVC-1A (self-respondent), the initial respondent answered the household characteristic questions, the household attitude questions, and the individual screening questions with any resulting incident report forms for himself only. Every other member of the household 16 or older was interviewed separately for the individual attitude questions, individual screening questions, and any resulting incident report forms.

In the commercial sector, the same technique of screening for incidents first and collecting details later was followed. The screening questionnaire, Form S-152 (see Illustration 5), had two parts: Part I covered characteristics of the business, and Part II contained questions on the number of burglaries and robberies, including attempts, occurring during 1970, as well as on the insurance coverage and protective measures taken by the business.

A distinct incident form for robbery and a similar one for burglary were completed if any incidents were reported on the screening section. The burglary form (Form S-152, Supplement A; see Illustration 6) included questions about time and place of occurrence, property damage, burglar alarm system, economic losses and recovery, and police notification.

The robbery form (Form S-152, Supplement B; see Illustration 7) excluded the questions on property damage and burglar alarm system, but contained questions on employee injuries and offender characteristics. A separate incident form was prepared for each burglary, robbery, and/or attempt.

O.M.B. No. 41-S7008 Approval Expires Mar 3 , 971

FORM SVC-1
(11-16-70)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR THE
LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

PILOT CITIES VICTIMIZATION SURVEY
1971

NOTICE – All information which would permit identification of the individual will be held strictly confidential, will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey and will not be disclosed or released to others for any other purpose.

A. Address (House No. and street) (*Apartment No. or other identification*)			Expected No. of units	B. Control number PSU	Segment No.	Serial No.
City	State	ZIP code				

C. Interviewer	D. Type of segment	E. Type of respondent	F. Geographic recode
	TA NTA	1 ☒ Household respondent 2 ☐ Self–respondent	

G. RECORD OF CALLS

Date	Time	Comments
	a.m. p.m.	
	a.m. p.m.	
	a.m. p.m.	
	a.m. p.m.	

H. REASON FOR NONINTERVIEW

Type A
- ☐ Refusal
- ☐ No one at home – Repeated calls
- ☐ Temporarily absent
  - Return date _____
- ☐ Other – Specify _____

Type B
- ☐ Vacant
- ☐ Usual residence elsewhere
- ☐ Other – Specify _____

Type C
- ☐ Demolished
- ☐ Other – Specify _____

I. RECORD OF INTERVIEW

Interview time: Began	Interview time: Ended	Date completed	Interview time: Began	Interview time: Ended	Date completed
a.m. p.m.	a.m. p.m.		a.m. p.m.	a.m. p.m.	
a.m. p.m.	a.m. p.m.		a.m. p.m.	a.m. p.m.	

Notes

SAMPLE

HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

☐ 1 of 1 ☐ 1 of 2 ☐ 1 of 3

1. Name (Last name first) What is the name of the head of this household? What are the names of all other persons who are living or staying here?	2. Line No.	3. Relationship to household head	4. Household member	5. Sex	6. Race	7. What is . . . 's origin or descent? (Read list)	8. Is . . . now in the armed forces?	9. What was . . . 's age on his last birthday?	10. Is . . . now married, widowed, divorced, separated, or never married?	11. What is the highest grade (or year) of regular school . . . has ever attended?	12. Did . . . complete that grade (year)?
				Fill for all household members						Fill for household members 16+	
Name (010)*	01	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011)* 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)* ____	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College ____ (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)*	02	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011)* 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)* ____	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College ____ (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)*	03	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011)* 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)* ____	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College ____ (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)*	04	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011)* 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)* ____	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College ____ (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)*	05	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011)* 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)* ____	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College ____ (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)*	06	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011)* 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)* ____	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College ____ (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)*	07	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011)* 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)* ____	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College ____ (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)*	08	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011)* 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)* ____	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College ____ (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)*	09	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011)* 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)* ____	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College ____ (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)*	10	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011)* 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)* ____	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College ____ (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)*	11	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011)* 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)* ____	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College ____ (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No

Notes

SAMPLE

FORM SVC 1A 11-16-70

HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS – Continued

13. I have listed *(Read names in item 1, page 2)* **Have I missed –**

	Circle
– any babies or small children?	Y N
– any lodgers, boarders, or persons in your employ who live here?	Y N
– anyone who usually lives here but is away at present traveling, or in a hospital?	Y N
– anyone else staying here?	Y N

14. Is this home (apartment) owned or being bought by you, or is it rented?

(013) 1 [ ] Owned or being bought
2 [ ] Rented
3 [ ] No cash rent

15a. How long has _____ lived in (head) this county?

(014) 1 [ ] 1 year or more
2 [ ] Less than a year

b. How many months?

(015) _____

16. What is your telephone number?

17. What is the best time to call?

a.m.

p.m.

18. What was the total income of this family during the past 12 months? This includes wages and salaries, net income from business or farm, pensions, dividends, interest, rent, and any other money income received by the members of this family.

(016)
01 Under $1,000
02 $ 1,000 to $ 1,999
03 2,000 to 2,999
04 3,000 to 3,999
05 4,000 to 4,999
06 5,000 to 5,999
07 6,000 to 7,499
08 7,500 to 9,999
09 10,000 to 14,999
10 15,000 to 24,999
11 25,000 and over

19. (Other than the . . . business) does anyone in this household operate a business from this address?

(017) 1 [ ] No
2 [ ] Yes – **What kind of business is that?**

_____

_____

Remarks

HOUSEHOLD SCREEN QUESTIONS

All of the following questions refer to the entire year of 1970, that is, between January 1 and December 31, of last year.

20. During 1970 did anyone break into or somehow illegally get into your (home/apartment), garage, or another building on your property?

20. (070) 0 [ ] No
[ ] Yes – **How many times?**
_____ (Property)

21. Did anyone get into a place where you or any member of your family were temporarily staying, such as a vacation home, a friend's home, or a hotel, and take something belonging to you or your family?

21. (071) 0 [ ] No
[ ] Yes – **How many times?**
_____ (Property)

22. (Other than the incidents just mentioned) did you find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an attempted break in?

22. (072) 0 [ ] No
[ ] Yes – **How many times?**
_____ (Property)

23. Was anything at all stolen that is kept outside your home, or happened to be left out, such as a bicycle, a garden hose, or lawn furniture?

23. (073) 0 [ ] No
[ ] Yes – **How many times?**
_____ (Property)

24. Did you or anyone in your family own a car or another motor vehicle anytime last year?

24. (074) 0 [ ] No – *SKIP to Interviewer Instruction, item 27*
[ ] Yes – **How many?**
_____ Number

25. Did anyone steal it, TRY to steal it, or use it without permission?

25. (075) 0 [ ] No
[ ] Yes – **How many times?**
_____ (Property)

26. Did anyone steal or TRY to steal part of the car itself, such as the battery, hubcaps, tape-deck, and so forth?

26. (076) 0 [ ] No – *SKIP to Interviewer Instruction, item 27*
Yes – **How many times?**
_____ (Property)

27. INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION

Ask Individual Screen Questions for each household member 16 or over listed on page 2, beginning with head of household.

SAMPLE

INDIVIDUAL SCREEN QUESTIONS

The following questions refer only to things that happened to _____ during 1970.
Name/you

(001) Line No.

28. Did . . . have his pocket picked/her purse snatched anytime last year?	28.	(080) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
29. Did anyone take something (else) directly from . . . either by using force or by threatening him/her, such as by a stickup or mugging?	29.	(081) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
30. Did anyone try to rob . . . by using force or threatening to harm him/her?	30.	(082) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
31. During 1970, did anyone steal things from inside a car, such as packages or clothing, that belonged to . . . ?	31.	(083) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
32. Was anything stolen from . . . while at work or somewhere else, such as in a theater or restaurant, or while traveling?	32.	(084) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
33. Was anything (else) stolen from . . . last year?	33.	(085) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
34. Did . . . find any evidence that someone ATTEMPTED to steal something that belonged to him/her?	34.	(086) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
35. (Other than any incidents you've already mentioned) during 1970, was . . . knifed, shot at, or attacked in some other way by anyone at all?	35.	(087) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
36. Did anyone beat . . . up, hit or kick him, or throw something, such as a rock or chair, at him?	36.	(088) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
37. Did anyone THREATEN to beat . . . up or THREATEN . . . with a knife, gun, stick, or some other weapon?	37.	(089) 1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Yes – **Was this a phone threat?** (090) o ☐ Yes ☐ No – **How many times were you threatened?** _____ (Personal)
38. Did anyone try to attack . . . in some other way?	38.	(091) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
39. (Other than any incidents you've mentioned before) Did . . . have any reason during 1970 to call the police to report something that happened to him which he thought was a crime?	39.	(092) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – *Describe* _____ ☐☐ _____ **In what month did this incident happen?** (093) _____ Month _____ Year
40. Did anything happen to . . . during 1970 which he thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police?	40.	(094) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – *Describe* _____ ☐☐ _____ **In what month did this incident happen?** (095) _____ Month _____ Year
41. **INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM** Is this the last household member about whom you are to ask the Individual Screen Questions?	41.	☐ No – *Ask Individual Screen Questions for next household member.* ☐ Yes – *All "No's" to Screen Questions for entire household?* ☐ Yes – *End interview* ☐ No – *Fill appropriate incident reports*

SAMPLE

FORM SVC-1 (11-16-70)

INDIVIDUAL SCREEN QUESTIONS – Continued

	(001) Line No.	(001) Line No.
28.	(080) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(080) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
29.	(081) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(081) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
30.	(082) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(082) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
31.	(083) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(083) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
32.	(084) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(084) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
33.	(085) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(085) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
34.	(086) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(086) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
35.	(087) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(087) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
36.	(088) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(088) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
37.	(089) 1 No 2 Yes – **Was this a phone threat?** (090) 0 Yes No – **How many times were you threatened?** _____ (Personal)	(089) 1 No 2 Yes – **Was this a phone threat?** (090) 0 Yes No – **How many times were you threatened?** _____ (Personal)
38.	(091) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(091) 0 No Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
39.	(092) 0 No Yes – *Describe* _____ **In what month did this incident happen?** (093) _____ Month _____ Year	(092) 0 No Yes – *Describe* _____ **In what month did this incident happen?** (093) _____ Month _____ Year
40.	(094) 0 No Yes – *Describe* _____ **In what month did this incident happen?** (095) _____ Month _____ Year	(094) 0 No Yes – *Describe* _____ **In what month did this incident happen?** (095) _____ Month _____ Year
41.	No – *Ask Individual Screen Questions for next household member* Yes – *All "No's" to Screen Questions for entire household?* Yes – *End interview* No – *Fill appropriate incident reports*	No – *Ask Individual Screen Questions for next household member* Yes – *All "No's" to Screen Questions for entire household?* Yes – *End interview* No – *Fill appropriate incident reports*

SAMPLE

INDIVIDUAL SCREEN QUESTIONS

The following questions refer only to things that happened to _____ during 1970.
Name/you

(001) Line No.

28. Did . . . have his pocket picked/her purse snatched anytime last year?	28.	(080) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
29. Did anyone take something (else) directly from . . . either by using force or by threatening him/her, such as by a stickup or mugging?	29.	(081) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
30. Did anyone try to rob . . . by using force or threatening to harm him/her?	30.	(082) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
31. During 1970, did anyone steal things from inside a car, such as packages or clothing, that belonged to . . . ?	31.	(083) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
32. Was anything stolen from . . . while at work or somewhere else, such as in a theater or restaurant, or while traveling?	32.	(084) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
33. Was anything (else) stolen from . . . last year?	33.	(085) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
34. Did . . . find any evidence that someone ATTEMPTED to steal something that belonged to him/her?	34.	(086) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
35. (Other than any incidents you've already mentioned) during 1970, was . . . knifed, shot at, or attacked in some other way by anyone at all?	35.	(087) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
36. Did anyone beat . . . up, hit or kick him, or throw something, such as a rock or chair, at him?	36.	(088) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
37. Did anyone THREATEN to beat . . . up or THREATEN . . . with a knife, gun, stick, or some other weapon?	37.	(089) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **Was this a phone threat?** (090) o ☐ Yes ☐ No – **How many times were you threatened?** _____ (Personal)
38. Did anyone try to attack . . . in some other way?	38.	(091) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
39. (Other than any incidents you've mentioned before) Did . . . have any reason during 1970 to call the police to report something that happened to him which he thought was a crime?	39.	(092) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – *Describe* _____ ☐☐ _____ **In what month did this incident happen?** (093) _____ Month _____ Year
40. Did anything happen to . . . during 1970 which he thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police?	40.	(094) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – *Describe* _____ ☐☐ _____ **In what month did this incident happen?** (095) _____ Month _____ Year
41. **INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM** Is this the last household member about whom you are to ask the Individual Screen Questions?	41.	☐ No – *Ask Individual Screen Questions for next household member.* ☐ Yes – *All "No's" to Screen Questions for entire household?* ☐ Yes – *End interview* ☐ No – *Fill appropriate incident reports*

SAMPLE

INDIVIDUAL SCREEN QUESTIONS – Continued

	(001) Line No.	(001) Line No.
28.	(080) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(080) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
29.	(081) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(081) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
30.	(082) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(082) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
31.	(083) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(083) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
32.	(084) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(084) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
33.	(085) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(085) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
34.	(086) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(086) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
35.	(087) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(087) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
36.	(088) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(088) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
37.	(089) 1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Yes – **Was this a phone threat?** (090) 0 ☐ Yes ☐ No – **How many times were you threatened?** _____ (Personal)	(089) 1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Yes – **Was this a phone threat?** (090) ☐ Yes ☐ No – **How many times were you threatened?** _____ (Personal)
38.	(091) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(091) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
39.	(092) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – *Describe* _____ ☐☐ _____ **In what month did this incident happen?** (093) _____ Month _____ Year	(092) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – *Describe* _____ ☐☐ _____ **In what month did this incident happen?** (093) _____ Month _____ Year
40.	(094) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – *Describe* _____ ☐☐ _____ **In what month did this incident happen?** (095) _____ Month _____ Year	(094) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – *Describe* _____ ☐☐ _____ **In what month did this incident happen?** (095) _____ Month _____ Year
41.	☐ No – *Ask Individual Screen Questions for next household member* ☐ Yes – *All "No's" to Screen Questions for entire household?* ☐ Yes – *End interview* ☐ No – *Fill appropriate incident reports*	☐ No – *Ask Individual Screen Questions for next household member* ☐ Yes – *All "No's" to Screen Questions for entire household?* ☐ Yes – *End interview* ☐ No – *Fill appropriate incident reports*

SAMPLE

FORM SVC-1A
(11-16-70)

O.M.B. No. 41-S70081; Approval Expires May 31, 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR THE
LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

PILOT CITIES VICTIMIZATION SURVEY
1971

NOTICE – All information which would permit identification of the individual will be held strictly confidential, will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey and will not be disclosed or released to others for any other purpose.

A. Address (House No. and street) *(Apartment No. or other identification)*			Expected No. of units	B. Control number PSU	Segment No.	Serial No.
City	State	ZIP code				

C. Interviewer	D. Type of segment	E. Type of respondent	F. Geographic recode
	TA NTA	1 ☐ Household respondent 2 ☒ Self–respondent	

G. RECORD OF CALLS

Date	Time	Comments
	a.m. p.m.	
	a.m. p.m.	
	a.m. p.m.	
	a.m. p.m.	

H. REASON FOR NONINTERVIEW

Type A
- ☐ Refusal
- ☐ No one at home – Repeated calls
- ☐ Temporarily absent
  - Return date _____
- ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

Type B
- ☑ Vacant
- ☐ Usual residence elsewhere
- ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

Type C
- ☐ Demolished
- ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

I. RECORD OF INTERVIEW

Interview time: Began	Interview time: Ended	Date completed	Interview time: Began	Interview time: Ended	Date completed
a.m. p.m.	a.m. p.m.		a.m. p.m.	a.m. p.m.	
a.m. p.m.	a.m. p.m.		a.m. p.m.	a.m. p.m.	

Notes

SAMPLE

HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

1. Name (Last name first) What is the name of the head of this household? What are the names of all other persons who are living or staying here?	2. Line No.	3. Relationship to household head	4. Household member	5. Sex	6. Race	7. What is . . . 's origin or descent? (Read list)	8. Is . . . now in the armed forces?	9. What was . . . 's age on his last birthday?	10. Is . . . now married, widowed, divorced, separated, or never married?	11. What is the highest grade (or year) of regular school . . . has ever attended?	12. Did . . . complete that grade (year)?
		Fill for all household members								Fill for household members 16+	
Name (010)	01	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011) 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)	02	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011) 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)	03	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011) 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)	04	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011) 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)	05	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011) 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)	06	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011) 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)	07	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011) 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)	08	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011) 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)	09	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011) 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)	10	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011) 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No
Name (010)	11	1 Head 2 Wife of head 3 Own child under 18 4 Other rel. 5 Non-relative	1 Yes 2 No	1 M 2 F	(011) 1 White 2 Negro 3 Other	1 Mexican 2 Other Spanish 3 Japanese Chinese 4 Other	1 Yes 2 No	(012)	1 Married 2 Widowed 3 Divorced 4 Separated 5 Never married	1 Never attended or Kindergarten 2 Elementary 3 High school 4 College (No. of years)	1 Yes 2 No

Notes

SAMPLE

HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS – Continued

13. I have listed *(Read names in item 1, page 2)* **Have I missed –**

	Circle Y N
– any babies or small children?	Y N
– any lodgers, boarders, or persons in your employ who live here?	Y N
– anyone who usually lives here but is away at present traveling, or in a hospital?	Y N
– anyone else staying here?	Y N

14. Is this home (apartment) owned or being bought by you, or is it rented?

(013) 1 ☐ Owned or being bought
2 ☐ Rented
3 ☐ No cash rent

15a. How long has _____ (head) **lived in this county?**

(014) 1 ☐ 1 year or more
2 ☐ Less than a year

b. How many months?

(015) _____

16. What is your telephone number?

17. What is the best time to call?

a.m.
p.m.

18. What was the total income of this family during the past 12 months? This includes wages and salaries, net income from business or farm, pensions, dividends, interest, rent, and any other money income received by the members of this family.

(Show flashcard where needed)

(016)
01 ☐ Under $1,000
02 ☐ $ 1,000 to $ 1,999
03 ☐ 2,000 to 2,999
04 ☐ 3,000 to 3,999
05 ☐ 4,000 to 4,999
06 ☐ 5,000 to 5,999
07 ☐ 6,000 to 7,499
08 ☐ 7,500 to 9,999
09 ☐ 10,000 to 14,999
10 ☐ 15,000 to 24,999
11 ☐ 25,000 and over

19. (Other than the . . . business) does anyone in this household operate a business from this address?

(017) 1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes – **What kind of business is that?**

_____

_____

Notes

HOUSEHOLD ATTITUDE QUESTIONS

20. How long have you lived at this address?

(031) 1 ☐ Less than 1 year
2 ☐ 1–2 years
3 ☐ 3–5 years
} *ASK 21a*
4 ☐ More than 5 years – *SKIP to 24a*

21a. Why did you select this particular neighborhood? Any other reason?

(Mark all that apply)

(032)*
1 ☐ Like the people in the area
2 ☐ Good schools
3 ☐ Safe from crime
4 ☐ No traffic problems
5 ☐ Only place I could find housing
6 ☐ Price was right
7 ☐ Close to job
8 ☐ The kind of neighborhood I wanted to live in
9 ☐ Liberal the house
0 ☐ Other – *Specify*

_____

(If more than one reason)
b. Which reason would you say was the most important?

(033) _____ *Enter item number*

22. Where did you live before you moved here?

(034)
1 ☐ Inside city limits of San Jose/Dayton
2 ☐ In this SMSA, outside city limits
3 ☐ Somewhere else – *Specify*

_____

(City, county and State)

23a. Why did you leave there? Any other reason?

• *(Mark all that apply)*

(035)
1 ☐ New job here or closer to job here
2 ☐ Climate (here or there)
3 ☐ Wanted better housing
4 ☐ Needed larger or smaller house/apartment
5 ☐ Better location – higher status
6 ☐ Old neighborhood run down
7 ☐ Bad "element" moving in
8 ☐ Crime in old neighborhood – afraid
9 ☐ Other – *Specify*

_____

(If more than one reason)
b. Which reason would you say was the most important?

(036) *Enter item number*

24a. Is there anything you don't like about this neighborhood?

(037)*
0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – **What? Anything else?** *(Mark all that apply)*
1 ☐ Traffic
2 ☐ Schools deteriorating or overcrowded
3 ☐ Crime or fear of crime
4 ☐ Public transportation problem
5 ☐ Inadequate shopping in area
6 ☐ Neighborhood changing – bad "element" moving in
7 ☐ Other – *Specify*

_____

(If more than one answer)
b. Which problem would you say is the most serious?

(038) _____ *Enter item number*

25. Do you do your major food shopping in this neighborhood?

(039) 0 ☐ Yes
☐ No – **Why not?** *(Mark most important)*
1 ☐ No stores in neighborhood
2 ☐ Stores in neighborhood inadequate (better stores elsewhere)
3 ☐ No parking in neighborhood
4 ☐ Crime or fear of crime
5 ☐ Other – *Specify*

_____

26a. When you shop for things other than food, such as clothing and general merchandise, do you USUALLY go to suburban or neighborhood shopping centers or do you shop "downtown"?

(040) 1 ☐ Suburban or neighborhood
2 ☐ Downtown

b. Why is that? Any other reason?

(Mark all that apply)

(041)*
1 ☐ Parking
2 ☐ Inadequate transportation
3 ☐ More convenient
4 ☐ Better selection
5 ☐ Afraid of crime
6 ☐ Store hours better
7 ☐ Other – *Specify*

_____

(If more than one reason)
c. Which one would you say was the most important reason?

(042) _____ *Enter item number*

27. INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION *Complete interview with initial respondent, beginning with Individual Attitude Questions. Then obtain interviews with all other household members 16 or over listed on page 2.*

SAMPLE

INDIVIDUAL ATTITUDE QUESTIONS

(001) Line No.

28a. How often do you go out in the evening for entertainment such as to dinner, a show or a club? — 28a. (044)
1 ☐ Once a week or more
2 ☐ Less than once a week – more than once a month
3 ☐ About once a month
4 ☐ 2 or 3 times a year
5 ☐ Less than 2 or 3 times a year or never

b. Do you go out more or less now than you did a year or two ago? — b. (045)
0 ☐ About the same – *SKIP to d*
1 ☐ More } Why?
2 ☐ Less }
3 ☐ Money situation
4 ☐ Convenience
5 ☐ Transportation
6 ☐ Family responsibility
7 ☐ Crime or fear of crime
8 ☐ Other – *Specify* ⟶

(If more than one reason)
c. Which reason would you say is the most important? — c.
(046) _____ *Enter item number*

(If box 1, 2, or 3 is marked in 28a, ask d. If not skip to question 29)
d. When you do go out for dinner or to a show in the evening, is it usually in the city or outside of the city? — d. (047)
1 ☐ Usually in the city
2 ☐ Usually outside of the city
3 ☐ About equal – *SKIP to 29*

e. Why do you usually go (outside the city) (in the city)? — e. (048)
1 ☐ More convenient
2 ☐ Parking problems
3 ☐ Too much crime in other place
4 ☐ More to do
5 ☐ Better facilities (restaurants, theaters, etc.)
6 ☐ More expensive in other area
7 ☐ Other – *Specify* ⟶

(If more than one reason)
f. Which reason would you say is the most important? — f.
(049) _____ *Enter item number*

Now I'd like to ask some questions about crime.
29. Within the past year or two, do you think that crime in your neighborhood has increased, decreased, or remained about the same? — 29. (050)
1 ☐ Increased
2 ☐ Decreased
3 ☐ Same
4 ☐ Don't know
5 ☐ Haven't lived here that long

30a. How safe do you feel being out alone in your neighborhood at night? — 30a. (051)
1 ☐ Very safe } *SKIP to 31*
2 ☐ Reasonably safe }
3 ☐ Somewhat unsafe
4 ☐ Very unsafe

b. How about during the day; how safe do you feel being out alone in your neighborhood? — b. (052)
1 ☐ Very safe
2 ☐ Reasonably safe
3 ☐ Somewhat unsafe
4 ☐ Very unsafe

c. Has anything ever happened to you in your neighborhood or to someone you know that makes you afraid to be on the streets around here? — c. (053)
1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes – *SKIP to e*

d. Have you read or heard about anything happening to other people on the streets in this neighborhood that makes you afraid to be out? — d. (054)
1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes

e. Is the neighborhood dangerous enough to make you think about moving somewhere else? — e. (055)
0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – Why don't you? *(Mark most important reason)*
1 ☐ Can't afford to
2 ☐ Can't find other housing
3 ☐ Relatives nearby
4 ☐ Convenient to work
5 ☐ Plan to move soon
6 ☐ Other – *Specify* ⟶

SAMPLE

INDIVIDUAL ATTITUDE QUESTIONS – Continued

(001) Line No.

28a. (044)
1 ☐ Once a week or more
2 ☐ Less than once a week – more than once a mo.
3 ☐ About once a month
4 ☐ 2 or 3 times a year
5 ☐ Less than 2 or 3 times a year or never

b. (045)*
0 ☐ About the same – *SKIP to d*
1 ☐ More } Why?
2 ☐ Less }
3 ☐ Money situation
4 ☐ Convenience
5 ☐ Transportation
6 ☐ Family responsibility
7 ☐ Crime or fear of crime
8 ☐ Other – *Specify* →

c. (046) _____ *Enter item number*

d. (047)
1 ☐ Usually in the city
2 ☐ Usually outside of the city
3 ☐ About equal – *SKIP to 29*

e. (048)*
1 ☐ More convenient
2 ☐ Parking problems
3 ☐ Too much crime in other place
4 ☐ More to do
5 ☐ Better facilities (restaurants, theaters, etc.)
6 ☐ More expensive in other area
7 ☐ Other – *Specify* →

f. (049) _____ *Enter item number*

29. (050)
1 ☐ Increased
2 ☐ Decreased
3 ☐ Same
4 ☐ Don't know
5 ☐ Haven't lived here that long

30a. (051)
1 ☐ Very safe } *SKIP to 31*
2 ☐ Reasonably safe }
3 ☐ Somewhat unsafe
4 ☐ Very unsafe

b. (052)
1 ☐ Very safe
2 ☐ Reasonably safe
3 ☐ Somewhat unsafe
4 ☐ Very unsafe

c. (053)
1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes – *SKIP to e*

d. (054)
1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes

e. (055)
0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – **Why don't you?** *(Mark most important reason)*
1 ☐ Can't afford to
2 ☐ Can't find other housing
3 ☐ Relatives nearby
4 ☐ Convenient to work
5 ☐ Plan to move soon
6 ☐ Other – *Specify* →

---

(001) Line No.

(044)
1 ☐ Once a week or more
2 ☐ Less than once a week – more than once a mo.
3 ☐ About once a month
4 ☐ 2 or 3 times a year
5 ☐ Less than 2 or 3 times a year or never

(045)*
0 ☐ About the same – *SKIP to d*
1 ☐ More } Why?
2 ☐ Less }
3 ☐ Money situation
4 ☐ Convenience
5 ☐ Transportation
6 ☐ Family responsibility
7 ☐ Crime or fear of crime
8 ☐ Other – *Specify* →

(046) _____ *Enter item number*

(047)
1 ☐ Usually in the city
2 ☐ Usually outside of the city
3 ☐ About equal – *SKIP to 29*

(048)*
1 ☐ More convenient
2 ☐ Parking problems
3 ☐ Too much crime in other place
4 ☐ More to do
5 ☐ Better facilities (restaurants, theaters, etc.)
6 ☐ More expensive in other area
7 ☐ Other – *Specify* →

(049) _____ *Enter item number*

(050)
1 ☐ Increased
2 ☐ Decreased
3 ☐ Same
4 ☐ Don't know
5 ☐ Haven't lived here that long

(051)
1 ☐ Very safe } *SKIP to 31*
2 ☐ Reasonably safe }
3 ☐ Somewhat unsafe
4 ☐ Very unsafe

(052)
1 ☐ Very safe
2 ☐ Reasonably safe
3 ☐ Somewhat unsafe
4 ☐ Very unsafe

(053)
1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes – *SKIP to e*

(054)
1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes

(055)
0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – **Why don't you?** *(Mark most important reason)*
1 ☐ Can't afford to
2 ☐ Can't find other housing
3 ☐ Relatives nearby
4 ☐ Convenient to work
5 ☐ Plan to move soon
6 ☐ Other – *Specify* →

---

(001) Line No.

(044)
1 ☐ Once a week or more
2 ☐ Less than once a week – more than once a mo.
3 ☐ About once a month
4 ☐ 2 or 3 times a year
5 ☐ Less than 2 or 3 times a year or never

(045)*
0 ☐ About the same – *SKIP to d*
1 ☐ More } Why?
2 ☐ Less }
3 ☐ Money situation
4 ☐ Convenience
5 ☐ Transportation
6 ☐ Family responsibility
7 ☐ Crime or fear of crime
8 ☐ Other – *Specify* →

(046) _____ *Enter item number*

(047)
1 ☐ Usually in the city
2 ☐ Usually outside of the city
3 ☐ About equal – *SKIP to 29*

(048)*
1 ☐ More convenient
2 ☐ Parking problems
3 ☐ Too much crime in other place
4 ☐ More to do
5 ☐ Better facilities (restaurants, theaters, etc.)
6 ☐ More expensive in other area
7 ☐ Other – *Specify* →

(049) _____ *Enter item number*

(050)
1 ☐ Increased
2 ☐ Decreased
3 ☐ Same
4 ☐ Don't know
5 ☐ Haven't lived here that long

(051)
1 ☐ Very safe } *SKIP to 31*
2 ☐ Reasonably safe }
3 ☐ Somewhat unsafe
4 ☐ Very unsafe

(052)
1 ☐ Very safe
2 ☐ Reasonably safe
3 ☐ Somewhat unsafe
4 ☐ Very unsafe

(053)
1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes – *SKIP to e*

(054)
1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes

(055)
0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – **Why don't you?** *(Mark most important reason)*
1 ☐ Can't afford to
2 ☐ Can't find other housing
3 ☐ Relatives nearby
4 ☐ Convenient to work
5 ☐ Plan to move soon
6 ☐ Other – *Specify* →

SAMPLE

INDIVIDUAL ATTITUDE QUESTIONS – Continued

(001) Line No.

31. How do you think your neighborhood compares with others in this metropolitan area? — 31. (056)
1 ☐ Much more dangerous
2 ☐ More dangerous
3 ☐ About average
4 ☐ Less dangerous
5 ☐ Much less dangerous

32a. Are there some parts of this metropolitan area where you have a reason to go during the day but are afraid to? — 32a. (057)
0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – **Which section(s)?**
_____ Number of specific places mentioned

b. How about at night? Are there some parts of this area where you have a reason to go but are afraid to? — b. (058)
0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – **Which section(s)?**
_____ Number of specific places mentioned

33a. Would you say, in general, that your local police are doing a good job, an average job, or a poor job? — 33a. (059)
1 ☐ Good – *SKIP to 34a.*
2 ☐ Average
3 ☐ Poor

b. In what way could they improve? — b.
(060) ☐☐

34a. Now I have some questions about your opinions. Please take this card. Look at the FIRST pair of statements. Which one do you agree with most? — 34a. (061)
1 ☐ Crimes of violence usually occur between people who know each other.
2 ☐ Crimes of violence usually occur between strangers.

b. Which of the SECOND group do you agree with most? — b. (062)
1 ☐ Crime is LESS serious than the newspapers and TV say.
2 ☐ Crime is MORE serious than the newspapers and TV say.
3 ☐ The newspapers and TV are about right.

c. Which of the THIRD group? — c. (063)
1 ☐ My chances of being attacked or robbed have gone up in the past few years.
2 ☐ I have less chance of being attacked or robbed now than in the past few years.
3 ☐ Things haven't changed in the past few years.

35. Do you think that most people in this neighborhood limit or change their activities because they are afraid of crime? — 35. (064)
1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

36. In general, have you limited or changed your activities because of crime? — 36. (065)
0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – **What have you done?**
☐☐

Notes

SAMPLE

FORM SVC-1a 11-16-70

INDIVIDUAL ATTITUDE QUESTIONS – Continued

	(001) Line No.	(001) Line No.	(001) Line No.
31.	(056) 1 ☐ Much more dangerous 2 ☐ More dangerous 3 ☐ About average 4 ☐ Less dangerous 5 ☐ Much less dangerous	(056) 1 ☐ Much more dangerous 2 ☐ More dangerous 3 ☐ About average 4 ☐ Less dangerous 5 ☐ Much less dangerous	(056) 1 ☐ Much more dangerous 2 ☐ More dangerous 3 ☐ About average 4 ☐ Less dangerous 5 ☐ Much less dangerous
32a.	(057) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **Which section(s)?** _____ ____ Number of specific places mentioned	(057) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **Which section(s)?** _____ ____ Number of specific places mentioned	(057) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **Which section(s)?** _____ ____ Number of specific places mentioned
b.	(058) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **Which section(s)?** _____ ____ Number of specific places mentioned	(058) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **Which section(s)?** _____ ____ Number of specific places mentioned	(058) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **Which section(s)?** _____ ____ Number of specific places mentioned
33a.	(059) 1 ☐ Good – *SKIP to 34a* 2 ☐ Average 3 ☐ Poor	(059) 1 ☐ Good – *SKIP to 34a* 2 ☐ Average 3 ☐ Poor	(059) 1 ☐ Good – *SKIP to 34a* 2 ☐ Average 3 ☐ Poor
b.	_____ _____ _____ (060) ☐☐	_____ _____ _____ (060) ☐☐	_____ _____ _____ (060) ☐☐
34a.	(061) 1 ☐ Crimes of violence usually occur between people who know each other. 2 ☐ Crimes of violence usually occur between strangers.	(061) 1 ☐ Crimes of violence usually occur between people who know each other. 2 ☐ Crimes of violence usually occur between strangers.	(061) 1 ☐ Crimes of violence usually occur between people who know each other. 2 ☐ Crimes of violence usually occur between strangers.
b.	(062) 1 ☐ Crime is LESS serious than the newspapers and TV say. 2 ☐ Crime is MORE serious than the newspapers and TV say. 3 ☐ The newspapers and TV are about right.	(062) 1 ☐ Crime is LESS serious than the newspapers and TV say. 2 ☐ Crime is MORE serious than the newspapers and TV say. 3 ☐ The newspapers and TV are about right.	(062) 1 ☐ Crime is LESS serious than the newspapers and TV say. 2 ☐ Crime is MORE serious than the newspapers and TV say. 3 ☐ The newspapers and TV are about right.
c.	(063) 1 ☐ My chances of being attacked or robbed have gone up in the past few years. 2 ☐ I have less chance of being attacked or robbed now than in the past few years. 3 ☐ Things haven't changed in the past few years.	(063) 1 ☐ My chances of being attacked or robbed have gone up in the past few years. 2 ☐ I have less chance of being attacked or robbed now than in the past few years. 3 ☐ Things haven't changed in the past few years.	(063) 1 ☐ My chances of being attacked or robbed have gone up in the past few years. 2 ☐ I have less chance of being attacked or robbed now than in the past few years. 3 ☐ Things haven't changed in the past few years.
35.	(064) 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No	(064) 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No	(064) 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No
36.	(065) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **What have you done?** ☐☐	(065) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **What have you done?** ☐☐	(065) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **What have you done?** ☐☐
	INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION A *Ask Individual Screen Questions, page 10*	**INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION A** *Ask Individual Screen Questions, page 10*	**INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION A** *Ask Individual Screen Questions, page 10*

Notes

SAMPLE

USCOMM-DC

NOTES

SAMPLE

HOUSEHOLD SCREEN QUESTIONS

All of the following questions refer to the entire year of 1970, that is, between January 1 and December 31 of last year.

37.	During 1970 did anyone break into or somehow illegally get into your (home apartment), garage, or another building on your property?	37. (070) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
38.	Did anyone get into a place where you or any member of your family were temporarily staying, such as a vacation home, a friend's home, or a hotel, and take something belonging to you or your family?	38. (071) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
39.	(Other than the incidents just mentioned) did you find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an attempted break in?	39. (072) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
40.	Was anything at all stolen that is kept outside your home, or happened to be left out, such as a bicycle, a garden hose, or lawn furniture?	40. (073) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
41.	Did you or anyone in your family own a car or another motor vehicle anytime last year?	41. (074) o ☐ No – *SKIP to Interviewer Instruction, item 44* ☐ Yes – **How many?** _____ Number
42.	Did anyone steal it, TRY to steal it, or use it without permission?	42. (075) o ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
43.	Did anyone steal or TRY to steal part of the car itself, such as the battery, hubcaps, tape-deck, and so forth?	43. (076) o ☐ No – *SKIP to Interviewer Instruction, item 44* ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)

44. **INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION**

Ask Individual Screen Questions for this respondent. Then obtain interviews with all other household members 16 or over, listed on page 2.

Notes

SAMPLE

USCOMM-DC

INDIVIDUAL SCREEN QUESTIONS

The following questions refer only to things that happened to you during 1970.

(001) Line No

45. Was your pocket picked/purse snatched anytime last year?

45. (080) 0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – How many times?
_____ (Personal)

46. Did anyone take something (else) directly from you either by using force or by threatening you, such as by a stickup or mugging?

46. (081) 0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – How many times?
_____ (Personal)

47. Did anyone TRY to rob you by using force or threatening to harm you?

47. (082) 0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – How many times?
_____ (Personal)

48. During 1970, did anyone steal things from inside a car, such as packages or clothing, that belonged to you?

48. (083) 0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – How many times?
_____ (Property)

49. Was anything stolen from you while at work or somewhere else, such as in a theater or restaurant, or while traveling?

49. (084) 0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – How many times?
_____ (Property)

50. Was anything (else) stolen from you last year?

50. (085) 0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – How many times?
_____ (Property)

51. Did you find any evidence that someone ATTEMPTED to steal something that belonged to you?

51. (086) 0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – How many times?
_____ (Property)

52. (Other than any incidents you've already mentioned) during 1970, were you knifed, shot at, or attacked in some other way by anyone at all?

52. (087) 0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – How many times?
_____ (Personal)

53. Did anyone beat you up, hit or kick you, or throw something, such as a rock or chair, at you?

53. (088) 0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – How many times?
_____ (Personal)

54. Did anyone THREATEN to beat you up or THREATEN you with a knife, gun, stick, or some other weapon?

54. (089) 1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes – Was this a phone threat?

(090) 0 ☐ Yes
☐ No – How many times threatened?
_____ (Personal)

55. Did anyone try to attack you in some other way?

55. (091) 0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – How many times?
_____ (Personal)

56. (Other than any incidents you've mentioned before) Did you have any reason during 1970 to call the police to report something that happened to you which you thought was a crime?

56. (092) 0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – Describe _____
_____
☐☐ _____

In what month did incident happen?

(093) _____ Month
_____ Year

57. Did anything happen to you during 1970 which you thought was a crime, but did NOT report to the police?

57. (094) 0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – Describe _____
_____
☐☐ _____

In what month did incident happen?

(095) _____ Month
_____ Year

58. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM

Did you receive all "No's" to the Screen Questions asked of this self-respondent?

58. ☐ Yes – *Obtain interview with next respondent 16 or over beginning with Individual Attitude Questions, page 4. End interview if this is last respondent.*
☐ No – *Fill appropriate Incident Reports.*

FORM SVC-14 11-16-70

SAMPLE

INDIVIDUAL SCREEN QUESTIONS – Continued

	(001) Line No.	(001) Line No.	(001) Line No.
45.	(080) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(080) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(080) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
46.	(081) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(081) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(081) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
47.	(082) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(082) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(082) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
48.	(083) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(083) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(083) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
49.	(084) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(084) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(084) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
50.	(085) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(085) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(085) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
51.	(086) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(086) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)	(086) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Property)
52.	(087) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(087) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(087) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
53.	(088) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(088) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(088) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
54.	(089) 1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Yes – **Was this a phone threat?** (090) 0 ☐ Yes ☐ No – **How many times threatened?** _____ (Personal)	(089) 1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Yes – **Was this a phone threat?** (090) 0 ☐ Yes ☐ No – **How many times threatened?** _____ (Personal)	(089) 1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Yes – **Was this a phone threat?** (090) 0 ☐ Yes ☐ No – **How many times threatened?** _____ (Personal)
55	(091) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(091) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)	(091) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – **How many times?** _____ (Personal)
56.	(092) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – *Describe* _____ ☐☐ _____ **In what month did incident happen?** (093) _____ Month _____ Year	(092) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – *Describe* _____ ☐☐ _____ **In what month did incident happen?** (093) _____ Month _____ Year	(092) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – *Describe* _____ ☐☐ _____ **In what month did incident happen?** (093) _____ Month _____ Year
57	(094) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – *Describe* _____ ☐☐ _____ **In what month did incident happen?** (095) _____ Month _____ Year	(094) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – *Describe* _____ ☐☐ _____ **In what month did incident happen?** (095) _____ Month _____ Year	(094) 0 ☐ No ☐ Yes – *Describe* _____ ☐☐ _____ **In what month did incident happen?** (095) _____ Month _____ Year
58.	☐ Yes – Interview next respondent 16+ beginning with Individual Attitude Q's, p. 4. End interview if this is last respondent. ☐ No – Fill appropriate Incident Reports	☐ Yes – Interview next respondent 16+ beginning with Individual Attitude Q's, p. 4. End interview if this is last respondent. ☐ No – Fill appropriate Incident Reports	☐ Yes – Interview next respondent 16+ beginning with Individual Attitude Q's, p. 4. End interview if this is last respondent. ☐ No – Fill appropriate Incident Reports

SAMPLE

FORM SVC-2
(11-18-70)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR THE
LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

PERSONAL CRIME INCIDENT REPORT

Pilot Cities Victimization Survey

1971

NOTICE – All information which would permit identification of the individual or household to which it pertains will be held strictly confidential, will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey and will not be disclosed or released to others for any other purpose.

Control No.

Screen No. (101)

Line No. (102)

Incident No. (103)

You said that during 1970 *(refer to appropriate screen question for description of type of crime). (If more than once)* Let's talk about the first time this happened.

1a. In what month did this incident happen?

1a. (104) _____ Month
_____ Year

b. About what time did it happen?

b. (105)
1 ☐ 6 a.m. to 6 p.m.
2 ☐ 6 p.m. to midnight
3 ☐ Midnight to 6 a.m.
4 ☐ Don't know

2. Where did this incident take place?

2. (106)
01 ☐ Inside own home/apartment
02 ☐ Inside garage or other building on property
03 ☐ Inside home of friend, relative, neighbor, vacation home
04 ☐ Near own home, in yard, sidewalk, etc.
05 ☐ On the street
06 ☐ Inside school
07 ☐ In park, field, playground, parking lot
08 ☐ In public conveyance or station
☐ Inside store, restaurant, bank, gas station, etc.
Were you a customer, employee, or owner?
09 ☐ Customer
10 ☐ Employee
11 ☐ Owner
12 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____
13 ☐ Inside office, factory, warehouse, etc.
14 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

3. What was the address?

3. (107)
0 ☐ Don't know
Address _____
☐☐

4. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM

Look at item 2. Did the incident take place inside own home, garage, etc., home of friend or relative, vacation home, or hotel or motel?

4. (108)
1 ☐ Yes – *ASK 5a*
2 ☐ No – *SKIP to 6*

5a. Did the person actually get in or just try to get in?

5a. (109)
1 ☐ Actually got in
2 ☐ Just tried to get in

b. Did the person(s) live there or have a right to be there?

b. (110)
1 ☐ Yes – *SKIP to 6*
2 ☐ No
3 ☐ Don't know
} *ASK 5c*

c. Was there any evidence, such as a broken lock or broken window, that the person forced his way in/tried to force his way in?

c. (111)
1 ☐ No – *SKIP to 5f*
☐ Yes – **What was the evidence?** *(Mark as many as apply)*
2 ☐ Broken window
3 ☐ Forced door
4 ☐ Slashed screen
5 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

d. What was the cost, if any, of repairing the damage done to the building when the person forced his way in/tried to force his way in?

d. (112)
0 ☐ None – *SKIP to 6*
$ _____ . 00 *(Dollars only)*
x ☐ Don't know

e. Who paid for the repairs? *(Mark as many as apply)*

e. (113)
1 ☐ Victim
2 ☐ Landlord
3 ☐ Insurance
4 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____
} *SKIP to 6*

f. How did the person(s) get in/try to get in?

f. (114) ☐☐

6. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM

Was the respondent present when the incident took place? *(If not sure, ask)*

6. (115)
1 ☐ Yes – *ASK 7*
2 ☐ No – *SKIP to 12a, page 3*

SAMPLE

PERSONAL CRIME INCIDENT QUESTIONS – Continued

7. Did this person(s) have a weapon such as a gun or knife or something he was using as a weapon such as a bottle, stick, or wrench?

7. (116)
1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Don't know
☐ Yes – **What was the weapon?**
3 ☐ Gun
4 ☐ Knife
5 ☐ Stick
6 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

8a. Did the person(s) hit you, knock you down or actually attack you in some other way?

8a. (117)
1 ☐ Yes – *SKIP to 8d*
2 ☐ No

b. Did the person(s) threaten you with harm in any way?

b. (118)
1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No – **What actually happened?**
☐☐ _____ *SKIP to 9*

c. How were you threatened?

c. (119) ☐☐ _____ *SKIP to 9*

d. How did the person(s) attack you?

d. (120) ☐☐

e. What were the injuries you suffered, if any?

e. (121) ☐☐
0 ☐ None – *SKIP to 9*

f. Were you injured to the extent that you needed medical attention after the attack?

f. (122)
1 ☐ No – *SKIP to 9*
2 ☐ Yes

g. Were you hospitalized?

g. (123)
0 ☐ No
☐ Yes – **How many days?** _____

9. Did you lose any time from your work because of this incident?

9. (124)
1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Not employed
☐ Yes – **How much time?**
3 ☐ Less than a day
4 ☐ 1–7 days
5 ☐ More than a week

10. Was the crime committed by ONLY ONE or more than one person?

10. (125)
1 ☐ Only one
2 ☐ Don't know – *SKIP to 11*
3 ☐ More than one

a. **How old would you say the person was? Was he –** (126)
1 ☐ **Under 12?**
2 ☐ **12–16?**
3 ☐ **17–20?**
4 ☐ **21 or over?**
5 ☐ Don't know

b. **Was the person someone you knew or was he a stranger?** (127)
1 ☐ Stranger
2 ☐ Don't know
☐ Knew
Was the person a relative of yours?
3 ☐ Yes
4 ☐ No

c. **Was the person male or female?** (128)
1 ☐ Male
2 ☐ Female
3 ☐ Don't know

d. **Was he/she –** (129)
1 ☐ **White?**
2 ☐ **Mexican?**
3 ☐ **Negro?**
4 ☐ **Other?**
Specify _____
5 ☐ Don't know
SKIP to 11

e. **Would you say the youngest person was –** (130)
1 ☐ **Under 12?**
2 ☐ **12–16?**
3 ☐ **17–20?**
4 ☐ **21 or over?** – *SKIP to g*
5 ☐ Don't know

f. **Would you say the oldest person was –** (131)
1 ☐ **Under 12?**
2 ☐ **12–16?**
3 ☐ **17–20?**
4 ☐ **21 or over?**
5 ☐ Don't know

g. **Were any of the persons known to you or were they all strangers?** (132)
1 ☐ All strangers
2 ☐ Don't know
3 ☐ Some known
☐ All known
Were they all relatives of yours?
4 ☐ Yes
5 ☐ No

h. **Were they male or female?** (133)
1 ☐ All male
2 ☐ All female
3 ☐ Male and female
4 ☐ Don't know

i. **Were they –** (134)
1 ☐ **Only white?**
2 ☐ **Only Mexican?**
3 ☐ **Only Negro?**
4 ☐ **Only other?**
Specify _____
5 ☐ **Both white and Negro?**
6 ☐ **Some other combination?**
Specify _____
7 ☐ Don't know

SAMPLE

PERSONAL CRIME INCIDENT QUESTIONS – Continued

11a. Were you the only person there besides the offender? — 11a. (135) 1 ☐ Yes – *SKIP to 12a* 2 ☐ No

b. How many of these persons were robbed/harmed or threatened? — b. (136) _____ Number 0 ☐ None

12a. Was something stolen or taken from you without your permission that belonged to you personally? — 12a. (139) 1 ☐ Yes ☐ No – **Did the person(s) ATTEMPT to take something from you?** 2 ☐ Yes / 3 ☐ No — *SKIP to 14*

(Interviewer: If respondent was the owner or employee of a store or other commercial establishment, do not include anything stolen from the business itself, such as cash from a register or merchandise.)

b. What was taken? — b. (140) $ _____ .00 cash *(Dollars only)*

and/or

(141) ☐☐ _____ (Property)

c. Where was the property when it was stolen? — c. (142)
1 ☐ Inside own home, garage or other building on property
2 ☐ Outside (but near) home
3 ☐ Inside car
4 ☐ On car (part of car)
5 ☐ On person (example: in pocket or being held)
6 ☐ In desk, locker, etc., at work
7 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

d. Altogether, what was the value of the property that was taken? (Exclude stolen cash) — d. (143) $ _____ .00 *(Dollars only)* x ☐ Cash only – *SKIP to 13a*

e. How did you decide the value of the property that was stolen? *(Mark as many as apply)* — e. (144)
1 ☐ Purchase price
2 ☐ Replacement cost
3 ☐ Personal estimate of current value
4 ☐ Insurance report estimate
5 ☐ Police estimate
6 ☐ Don't know
7 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

13a. Did you get all or part of the stolen money or property back, including anything replaced by insurance? — 13a. (145) 1 ☐ None 2 ☐ All 3 ☐ Part — *SKIP to 14*

b. What did you get back? — b. (146) $ _____ .00 cash *(Dollars only)*

and/or

(147) ☐☐

c. What was the value of the property you got back? — c. (148) $ _____ .00 *(Dollars only)* x ☐ Cash only recovered

14. Did you or anyone else tell the police about this incident? — 14. (149) ☐ Yes – **Who told the police?**
1 ☐ Victim
2 ☐ Relative
3 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____
4 ☐ No – **What was the reason you did not tell the police?**

(150) ☐☐

15a. Was the incident reported to anyone else, such as your insurance company, a security guard or apartment manager? — 15a. (151) 1 ☐ No – *SKIP to 16* ☐ Yes – **To whom was the incident reported?** *(Mark as many as apply)*
2 ☐ Insurance company
3 ☐ Security guard
4 ☐ Apartment manager or landlord
5 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

b. Who reported it? — b. (152) 1 ☐ Victim
2 ☐ Relative
3 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

16. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM — 16. (153) (154) (155)

Is this the last incident sheet to be filled?

☐ No – *Go to next incident sheet*

☐ Yes – *End interview*

SAMPLE

O.M.B. No. 41S-70081, Approval Expires May 31, 1971

FORM SVC-3
11-16-70

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR THE
LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

PROPERTY CRIME INCIDENT REPORT

Pilot Cities Victimization Survey

1971

NOTICE – All information which would permit identification of the individual will be held strictly confidential, will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey and will not be disclosed or released to others for any other purpose.

Control No.

Screen Question No. (201)

Line No. (202)

Incident No. (203)

You said that during 1970 *(refer to appropriate screen question for description of type of crime). (If more than once)* **Let's talk about the first time this happened.**

1. **INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM**
Is this incident report for theft of car or part of car?

1. (204) 1 ☐ No – *SKIP to 2*
☐ Yes – **Who was the principal user of this car?**
2 ☐ Head
3 ☐ Wife of head
4 ☐ Son or daughter of head
5 ☐ Entire family
6 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

2. **In what month did this incident happen?**

2. (205) _____ Month
_____ Year

3. **About what time did it happen?**

3. (206) 1 ☐ 6 a.m. to 6 p.m.
2 ☐ 6 p.m. to midnight
3 ☐ Midnight to 6 a.m.
4 ☐ Don't know

4. **Where did this incident take place?**

4. (207) 01 ☐ Inside own home/apartment
02 ☐ Inside garage or other building on property
03 ☐ Inside home of friend, relative, neighbor, vacation home
04 ☐ Near home, in yard, sidewalk, etc.
05 ☐ On the street
06 ☐ Inside school
07 ☐ In park, field, playground, parking lot
08 ☐ In public conveyance or station
☐ Inside store, restaurant, bank or other commercial building
Were you a customer, employee, or owner?
09 ☐ Customer
10 ☐ Employee
11 ☐ Owner
12 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____
13 ☐ Inside office, factory, warehouse, etc.
14 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

5. **What was the address?**

5. (208) 0 ☐ Don't know
Address
☐☐

6a. **INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM**
Look at item 4. Did the incident take place inside own home, garage, etc., home of a friend or relative, vacation home, or hotel or motel?

6a. (209) 1 ☐ No – *SKIP to 7a*
2 ☐ Yes

b. **Did the person(s) actually get in or just try to get in?**

b. (210) 1 ☐ Actually got in
2 ☐ Just tried to get in

c. **Did the person(s) live there or have a right to be there?**

c. (211) 1 ☐ Yes – *SKIP to 7a*
2 ☐ No
3 ☐ Don't know

d. **Was there any evidence, such as a broken lock or broken window, that the person forced his way in/tried to force his way in?**

d. (212) 1 ☐ No – *SKIP to g*
☐ Yes – **What was the evidence?**
2 ☐ Broken window
3 ☐ Forced door
4 ☐ Slashed screen
5 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

SAMPLE

PROPERTY CRIME INCIDENT QUESTIONS – Continued

6e. What was the cost, if any, of repairing the damage done to the building when the person forced his way in/tried to force his way in?

6e. (213)
- 0 None – *SKIP to 7a*
- $ _____ .00 (Dollars only)
- x Don't know

f. Who paid for the repairs? *(Mark as many as apply)*

f. (214)
- 1 Victim
- 2 Landlord
- 3 Insurance
- 4 Other – Specify _____

SKIP to 7a

g. How did the person(s) get in/try to get in?

g. (215) [ ][ ]

7a. Were you or anyone in your family present when this incident occurred?

7a. (216)
- 1 No – *SKIP to 8a*
- 2 Yes

b. Did the person(s) have a weapon such as a gun or knife or something he was using as a weapon such as a bottle, stick or wrench?

b. (217)
- 1 Yes – *SKIP to Personal Crime Incident Report Q. 7. Keep this form – note your action at top of first page.*
- 2 No
- 3 Don't know

c. Did the person(s) hit you/them, knock you/them down or actually attack you/them in some other way?

c. (218)
- 1 Yes – *SKIP to Personal Crime Incident Report Q. 8d. Keep this form – note your action at top of first page.*
- 2 No

d. Did the person(s) threaten you/them with harm in any way?

d. (219)
- 1 Yes – *SKIP to Personal Crime Incident Report Q. 8c. Keep this form – note your action at top of first page.*
- 2 No

8a. Was something stolen or taken from you without your permission that belonged to you personally, or to any member of your family?

(Interviewer: If respondent was the owner or employee of a store or other commercial establishment, do not include anything stolen from the business itself, such as cash from a register or merchandise.)

8a. (220)
- 1 Yes
- 2 No – **Did the person(s) ATTEMPT to take something from you?**
  - 2 Yes
  - 3 No

  SKIP to 12

b. What was taken?

b. (221) $ _____ .00 cash *(Dollars only)*

and/or

(222) [ ][ ] _____ (Property)

c. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM

Look at 8b. Was a car or other motor vehicle reported taken?

c. (223)
- 1 No – *SKIP to 9*
- 2 Yes

d. Was the person who took your (car/other motor vehicle) –

d. (224)
- 1 **A relative?**
- 2 **A friend?**
- 3 **An employee?**
- 4 **Somebody else you knew?** – Specify _____
- 5 **A stranger?**
- 6 Don't know

e. Did this person return your (car/other motor vehicle)?

e. (225)
- 1 Yes
- 2 No

9. Where was the property when it was stolen?

9. (226)
- 1 Inside own home, garage or other building on property
- 2 Outside (but near) home
- 3 Inside car
- 4 On car (part of car)
- 5 On person (example: in pocket or being held)
- 6 In desk, locker, etc. at work
- 7 Other – *Specify* _____

SAMPLE

PROPERTY CRIME INCIDENT QUESTIONS – Continued

10a. Altogether, what was the value of the property that was taken? *(Exclude stolen cash)*

10a. (227) x ☐ Cash only – *SKIP to 11a*

$ _____ .00 *(Dollars only)*

b. How did you decide the value of the property that was stolen? *(Mark as many as apply)*

b. (228)
1 ☐ Purchase price
2 ☐ Replacement cost
3 ☐ Personal estimate of current value
4 ☐ Insurance report estimate
5 ☐ Police estimate
6 ☐ Don't know
7 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

11a. Did you get all or part of the stolen money or property back, including anything replaced by insurance?

11a. (229)
0 ☐ None
1 ☐ All
} *SKIP to 12*
2 ☐ Part

b. What did you get back?

b. (230) $ _____ .00 *(Dollars only)*

and/or

(231) ☐☐ _____

c. What was the value of the property you got back? *(Exclude recovered cash)*

c. (232) x ☐ Cash only recovered

$ _____ .00 *(Dollars only)*

12. Did you or anyone else tell the police about this incident?

12. (233)
☐ Yes – **Who told the police?**
1 ☐ Victim
2 ☐ Relative
3 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____
4 ☐ No – **What was the reason you did not tell the police?**

_____

(234) ☐☐

13a. Was the incident reported to anyone else, such as your insurance company, a security guard or apartment manager?

13a. (236)
1 ☐ No – *SKIP to 14*
☐ Yes – **To whom was it reported?** *(Mark as many as apply)*
2 ☐ Insurance company
3 ☐ Security guard
4 ☐ Apartment manager or landlord
5 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

b. Who reported it?

b. (238)
1 ☐ Victim
2 ☐ Relative
3 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____

14. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM

Is this the last incident sheet to be filled?

1 ☐ No – *Go to next incident sheet*

2 ☐ Yes – *End interview*

14. (239)

(240)

(241)

Notes

SAMPLE

C.M.B. No 41-S70081, Approval Expires May 31, 1971

NOTICE – Your report to the Census Bureau is confidential by law (Title 13, U.S. Code). It may be seen only by sworn Census employees and may be used only for statistical purposes.

FORM S-152
11-18-70

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

COMMERCIAL VICTIMIZATION SURVEY
PILOT CITIES

1. IDENTIFICATION CODES

1	2 RO	3–6 Segment	7–9 Line number
1			

INTRODUCTION

Good morning (afternoon). I'm Mrs. _____ from the U.S. Bureau of the Census. We are conducting a survey in this area to measure the amount of burglaries and robberies to which businesses have been exposed. In order to fight crime, the Government needs to know how much crime there is and where it is. Many crimes, especially small ones, are never reported to the police and we are anxious to have a true measure of the extent of robberies and burglaries. You can help by answering some questions for me.

Part I – BUSINESS CHARACTERISTICS

2. Person furnishing information [10]
- 1 ☐ Owner or partner
- 2 ☐ Manager
- 3 ☐ Clerk
- 4 ☐ Accountant
- 5 ☐ Other – Specify _____

3. Is this business owned as an individual proprietorship, a partnership, a corporation, or some other way? [11]
- 1 ☐ Individual proprietorship
- 2 ☐ Partnership
- 3 ☐ Corporation
- 4 ☐ Other – Specify _____

4. How many establishments, including this one, are operated by you (the owner)? [12]
- 1 ☐ One
- 2 ☐ 2 to 10
- 3 ☐ 11 or more

5. Did you (the owner) operate this business at this location at the end of 1970? [13]
- 1 ☐ Yes – How many months during 1970? _____ [14–15]
- 2 ☐ No – *Try to find prior owner and interview him.*

6. Excluding you (the owner) (the partners), how many paid employees did this business average during 1970? [16]
- 1 ☐ None
- 2 ☐ 1–3
- 3 ☐ 4–7
- 4 ☐ 8–19
- 5 ☐ 20 or more

7a. What do you consider your kind of business to be?

_____

b. What are the principal lines of merchandise sold, products manufactured, or services performed? [17–18]

_____

_____

_____

(Mark the ONE box for the activity which best describes this business)

- 01 ☐ Agricultural services
- 02 ☐ Communication
- 03 ☐ Construction
- 04 ☐ Electric, gas, and sanitary services
- 05 ☐ Finance and credit
- 06 ☐ Insurance
- 07 ☐ Manufacturing
- 08 ☐ Real estate
- 09 ☐ Retail
- 10 ☐ Services
- 11 ☐ Transportation
- 12 ☐ Wholesale
- 13 ☐ Other – Specify _____

8. Did anyone else operate any leased departments or concessions in this store during 1970? [19]
- 1 ☐ Yes – *Obtain information on leased department(s) as well as main establishment. Complete separate questionnaire(s) for leased department(s) if owner of main establishment cannot give leased department(s) information.*
- 2 ☐ No

DO NOT ASK ITEM 9 UNTIL PART II AND SUPPLEMENTS A AND B HAVE BEEN COMPLETED

9. What were your approximate sales or receipts for the year ending December 31, 1970? [20]

END THE INTERVIEW

- 1 ☐ Under $10,000
- 2 ☐ $10,000 to $24,999
- 3 ☐ $25,000 to $49,999
- 4 ☐ $50,000 to $99,999
- 5 ☐ $100,000 to $499,999
- 6 ☐ $500,000 to $999,999
- 7 ☐ $1,000,000 and over
- 8 ☐ Other – Specify _____

ENUMERATOR USE ONLY

10a. Reason for non-interview [21]
- 1 ☐ On vacation
- 2 ☐ Vacant; unable to contact landlord or prior tenants
- 3 ☐ Other – Specify _____

b. Record of interview

Date	Time: Began	Time: Ended	22–24 Length of interview
	a.m. p.m.	a.m. p.m.	Min.

Notes

SAMPLE

Part II – SCREENING QUESTIONS

Now we'd like to know whether this business (or its leased departments and concessions) was a victim of either burglary or robbery last year. 1a. During 1970, did anyone break into this place of business?	25 1 ☐ Yes – *Go to 1b* 2 ☐ No – *Skip to 1c*
b. How many times did this happen during 1970?	26–27 Number _____ *Fill a Supplement A page for each incident*
If "Yes" in 1a add "Other than the incident(s) just mentioned," c. During 1970, did you or anyone who works here find a door jimmied, a lock forced, or any other signs of an attempted break-in?	28 1 ☐ Yes – *Go to 1d* 2 ☐ No – *Skip to 2a*
d. How many times did this happen during 1970?	29–30 Number _____ *Fill a Supplement A page for each incident*
The next questions cover robbery and attempted robbery, where the robber used a weapon, force, or the threat of force. 2a. During 1970, were you or anyone who works here held up or robbed while at work?	31 1 ☐ Yes – *Go to 2b* 2 ☐ No – *Skip to 2c*
b. How many times did this happen during 1970?	32–33 Number _____ *Fill a Supplement B page for each incident*
c. During 1970, were you or anyone who works here held up or robbed while delivering merchandise or carrying business money outside the business?	34 1 ☐ Yes – *Go to 2d* 2 ☐ No – *Skip to 3a*
d. How many times did this happen during 1970?	35–36 Number _____ *Fill a Supplement B page for each incident*
3a. Do you now have, or have you ever had insurance against burglary and/or robbery?	37 1 ☐ Yes, now have it – *Complete 3b, then skip to 4a* 2 ☐ Used to have it – *Complete 3b and 3c, then skip to 4a* 3 ☐ Never had it – *Skip to 3d* 4 ☐ Don't know – *Skip to 4a*
b. Does (did) the insurance also cover other types of crime losses, such as vandalism or shoplifting and employee theft?	38 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No
c. You said you used to have this insurance. Did you drop it or did the company cancel your policy?	39 1 ☐ Businessman dropped it 2 ☐ Insurance company cancelled policy
d. Why haven't you ever had insurance against burglary or robbery?	40 1 ☐ You felt you couldn't afford it 2 ☐ You felt you couldn't get anyone to insure you 3 ☐ You felt you didn't need it 4 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____
4a. What active steps, if any, have you taken to protect your store against burglary and robbery during 1970?	41–49 1 ☐ Alarm system – outside ringing 2 ☐ Central alarm 3 ☐ Reinforcing devices, such as windows, grates, bars, etc. 4 ☐ Guard, watchman, or other security 5 ☐ Watch dogs 6 ☐ Firearms 7 ☐ Cameras 8 ☐ Other – *Specify* _____ 9 ☐ None – *Do not ask 4b*
Refer to items 1a, 1c, 2a and 2c above. If the answer to any question is yes, ask this question. Otherwise, go to item 9, part I. b. Was (were) the step(s) to protect your business taken after the crime(s) you just told me about was (were) committed?	50 1 ☐ Yes – **Which steps were taken after the crime was committed?** *(From 4a above)* 51–58 1 ☐ 3 ☐ 5 ☐ 7 ☐ 2 ☐ 4 ☐ 6 ☐ 8 ☐ 2 ☐ No
Notes	

SAMPLE

FORM S-152 (11-18-70)

If no incidents, be sure to go back to part I and ask item 9.

O.M.B No. 41-S70081. Approval Expires Mar 3 1971

Transcribe the identification codes from item I of the cover sheet and complete a separate incident page for EACH burglary.	FORM S-152 (SUPP. A) (11-16-70) U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS BURGLARY SHEET **COMMERCIAL VICTIMIZATION SURVEY** PILOT CITIES

1. IDENTIFICATION CODES

1	2 RO	3–6 Segment	7–9 Line Number	10–11	**BURGLARY INCIDENT NUMBER** *Record which incident (1st, 2nd, etc.) is covered by this page.*
2					

Question	Code	Answer
Read only for the FIRST incident. **This series of questions deals with the burglary(ies) or attempted burglary(ies) you had during 1970.** **2. What month in 1970 did this (the . . .) incident take place?**	12–13	01 ☐ January 05 ☐ May 09 ☐ September 02 ☐ February 06 ☐ June 10 ☐ October 03 ☐ March 07 ☐ July 11 ☐ November 04 ☐ April 08 ☐ August 12 ☐ December
3. About what time did it happen?	14	1 ☐ 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. 3 ☐ Midnight to 6 a.m. 2 ☐ 6 p.m. to midnight 4 ☐ Don't know
4. Did the person actually get in or just try to get in?	15	1 ☐ Actually got in 2 ☐ Just tried to get in
5. Was there evidence, such as a broken lock, a broken window, or an alarm, that the burglar forced his way in?	16	1 ☐ Yes – *Go to 6* 2 ☐ No – *Skip to 7a*
6. What was the cost, if any, of repairing the damage done to the building when the burglar forced his way in?	17–21	$ ____________ 1 ☐ None 2 ☐ Don't know
7a. Do you have a burglar alarm system?	22	1 ☐ Yes – *Go to 7b* 2 ☐ No – *Skip to 8a*
b. Did the burglar trigger the alarm system when he broke in?	23	1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No
c. How effective do you feel your burglar alarm is in preventing burglary?	24	1 ☐ Excellent 4 ☐ Poor 2 ☐ Good 5 ☐ Doesn't know, no opinion 3 ☐ Fair
Refer to item 4 above. If box 2 is marked, skip to item 9. **8a. Did the burglar take any money?**	25 / 26–30	1 ☐ Yes – **How much?** $____________ 2 ☐ No
b. Did the burglar take any merchandise, equipment, or supplies?	31 / 32–36	1 ☐ Yes – **What was the value?** $____________ 2 ☐ No – *Skip to 9a*
c. How was the value determined?	37	1 ☐ Original cost 2 ☐ Replacement cost 3 ☐ Other – *Specify* ____________
Refer to item 3a, part II. If either box 3 or 4 is marked, do NOT ask 9a but mark box 2 or 3 respectively, then continue with item 9b. **9a. How much, if any, of your loss, including repair to the building, was recovered by insurance?**	38–42	$ ____________ 2 ☐ Does not have insurance 1 ☐ None 3 ☐ Don't know
b. How much, if any, of your loss was recovered by means other than insurance?	43–47	$ ____________ – *Go to 9c* 1 ☐ None } *Skip to 10* 2 ☐ Don't know }
c. How was it recovered? (For example, returned by the police.)		____________
10. Was this incident reported to the police?	48	1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No
11. Was (were) the burglar(s) caught?	49	1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 3 ☐ Don't know

Notes

REMINDER: Be sure to go back to part I and ask item 9.

SAMPLE

O.M.B No. 41-S70081; Approval Expires May 31, 1971

Transcribe the identification codes from item I of the cover sheet and complete a separate incident page for EACH burglary.	FORM S-152 (SUPP. A) (11-18-70) U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS BURGLARY SHEET **COMMERCIAL VICTIMIZATION SURVEY** PILOT CITIES

1. IDENTIFICATION CODES

1	2 RO	3–6 Segment	7–9 Line Number	10–11	**BURGLARY INCIDENT NUMBER** *Record which incident (1st, 2nd, etc.) is covered by this page.*
2					

Question	Code	Response
Read only for the FIRST incident. **This series of questions deals with the burglary(ies) or attempted burglary(ies) you had during 1970.** **2. What month in 1970 did this (the . . .) incident take place?**	12–13	01 ☐ January 02 ☐ February 03 ☐ March 04 ☐ April 05 ☐ May 06 ☐ June 07 ☐ July 08 ☐ August 09 ☐ September 10 ☐ October 11 ☐ November 12 ☐ December
3. About what time did it happen?	14	1 ☐ 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. 2 ☐ 6 p.m. to midnight 3 ☐ Midnight to 6 a.m. 4 ☐ Don't know
4. Did the person actually get in or just try to get in?	15	1 ☐ Actually got in 2 ☐ Just tried to get in
5. Was there evidence, such as a broken lock, a broken window, or an alarm, that the burglar forced his way in?	16	1 ☐ Yes – *Go to 6* 2 ☐ No – *Skip to 7a*
6. What was the cost, if any, of repairing the damage done to the building when the burglar forced his way in?	17–21	$______ 1 ☐ None 2 ☐ Don't know
7a. Do you have a burglar alarm system?	22	1 ☐ Yes – *Go to 7b* 2 ☐ No – *Skip to 8a*
b. Did the burglar trigger the alarm system when he broke in?	23	1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No
c. How effective do you feel your burglar alarm is in preventing burglary?	24	1 ☐ Excellent 2 ☐ Good 3 ☐ Fair 4 ☐ Poor 5 ☐ Doesn't know; no opinion
Refer to item 4 above. If box 2 is marked, skip to item 9. **8a. Did the burglar take any money?**	25 / 26–30	1 ☐ **Yes – How much?** $______ 2 ☐ No
b. Did the burglar take any merchandise, equipment, or supplies?	31 / 32–36	1 ☐ **Yes – What was the value?** $______ 2 ☐ No – *Skip to 9a*
c. How was the value determined?	37	1 ☐ Original cost 2 ☐ Replacement cost 3 ☐ Other – *Specify*______
Refer to item 3a, part II. If either box 3 or 4 is marked, do NOT ask 9a but mark box 2 or 3 respectively, then continue with item 9b. **9a. How much, if any, of your loss, including repair to the building, was recovered by insurance?**	38–42	$______ 1 ☐ None 2 ☐ Does not have insurance 3 ☐ Don't know
b. How much, if any, of your loss was recovered by means other than insurance?	43–47	$______ – *Go to 9c* 1 ☐ None 2 ☐ Don't know } *Skip to 10*
c. How was it recovered? (For example, returned by the police.)		______
10. Was this incident reported to the police?	48	1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No
11. Was (were) the burglar(s) caught?	49	1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 3 ☐ Don't know

Notes

***REMINDER:** Be sure to go back to part I and ask item 9.*

SAMPLE

O.M.B. No. 41-S70081; Approval Expires May 31, 1971

Transcribe the identification codes from item 1 of the cover sheet and complete a separate incident page for EACH robbery.

FORM S-152 (SUPP. B) (11-18-70)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

ROBBERY SHEET
COMMERCIAL VICTIMIZATION SURVEY
PILOT CITIES

1. IDENTIFICATION CODES

1	2 RO	3–6 Segment	7–9 Line Number	10–11	◀ **ROBBERY INCIDENT NUMBER** Record which incident (1st, 2nd, etc.) is covered by this page
3					

Read only for the FIRST incident.

This series of questions deals with the robbery(ies) you had during 1970.

2. What month in 1970 did this (the . . .) robbery take place?

12–13
01 ☐ January 05 ☐ May 09 ☐ September
02 ☐ February 06 ☐ June 10 ☐ October
03 ☐ March 07 ☐ July 11 ☐ November
04 ☐ April 08 ☐ August 12 ☐ December

3. About what time did it happen?

14
1 ☐ 6 a.m. to 6 p.m.
2 ☐ 6 p.m. to midnight
3 ☐ Midnight to 6 a.m.

4a. Did this robbery take place at this place of business?

15
1 ☐ Yes – *Skip to 5a*
2 ☐ No – *Go to 4b*

b. Where did the robbery take place?

____

5a. Did the robber take any money belonging to the business? (Do not include money taken from customers or store personnel.)

16
1 ☐ Yes – **How much?** 17–21 $ __________
2 ☐ No – *Go to 5b*

b. Did the robber take any merchandise, equipment, or supplies? (Do not include personal property taken from customers or store personnel.)

22
1 ☐ Yes – **What was the total value?** 23–27 $ __________
2 ☐ No – *Skip to 6a*

c. How was the value determined?

28
1 ☐ Original cost
2 ☐ Replacement cost
3 ☐ Other – *Specify* __________

Refer to item 3a, part II. If either box 3 or 4 is marked, do NOT ask 6a but mark box 2 or 3 respectively, then continue with item 6b.

6a. How much, if any, of your loss was recovered by insurance?

29–33
$ __________
1 ☐ None
2 ☐ Does not have insurance
3 ☐ Don't know

b. How much, if any, of your loss was recovered by means other than insurance?

34–38
$ __________ – *Go to 6c*
1 ☐ None
2 ☐ Don't know } *Skip to 7a*

c. How was it recovered? (For example, returned by the police.)

____

7a. Was a weapon used when your (this) business was robbed?

39
1 ☐ Yes – *Go to 7b*
2 ☐ No – *Skip to 8a*

b. What was the weapon?

40
1 ☐ Gun
2 ☐ Knife
3 ☐ Other – *Specify* __________

8a. Were you or any of the employees injured in this robbery seriously enough to require medical attention?

41
1 ☐ Yes – **How many?** 42–46 ______ – *Go to 8b*
2 ☐ No – *Skip to 9*

b. How many of them were hospitalized?

47–48
Number ______

9. Did you or any of the employees lose any days from work due to injuries resulting from this robbery?

49
1 ☐ Yes – **How many days?** 50–52 ______
2 ☐ No

10. Was this robbery reported to the police?

53
1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

11. Was (were) the robber(s) caught?

54
1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No
3 ☐ Don't know

12. How many robbers were involved in this incident?

55–56
Number ______

13. To your knowledge, what were the characteristics of the robber(s) in terms of sex, race, and age?

Offender characteristics			Number of persons per robbery incident
SEX	Male	57	
	Female	58	
RACE	White	59	
	Negro	60	
	Other	61	
AGE	Teenager	62	
	20 – 30	63	
	30 – 50	64	
	50 or older	65	

REMINDER:* *Be sure to go back to part I and ask item 9.

SAMPLE

O.M.B. No. 41-S70081; Approval Expires May 31, 1971

Transcribe the identification codes from item I of the cover sheet and complete a separate incident page for EACH robbery.

FORM S-152 (SUPP. B) (11-18-70)
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

ROBBERY SHEET
COMMERCIAL VICTIMIZATION SURVEY
PILOT CITIES

1. IDENTIFICATION CODES

1	2 RO	3–6 Segment	7–9 Line Number	10–11
3				

ROBBERY INCIDENT NUMBER
Record which incident (1st, 2nd, etc.) is covered by this page.

Read only for the FIRST incident.
This series of questions deals with the robbery(ies) you had during 1970.

2. What month in 1970 did this (the . . .) robbery take place?

12–13
01 ☐ January 05 ☐ May 09 ☐ September
02 ☐ February 06 ☐ June 10 ☐ October
03 ☐ March 07 ☐ July 11 ☐ November
04 ☐ April 08 ☐ August 12 ☐ December

3. About what time did it happen?

14
1 ☐ 6 a.m. to 6 p.m.
2 ☐ 6 p.m. to midnight
3 ☐ Midnight to 6 a.m.

4a. Did this robbery take place at this place of business?

15
1 ☐ Yes – *Skip to 5a*
2 ☐ No – *Go to 4b*

b. Where did the robbery take place?

____

5a. Did the robber take any money belonging to the business? (Do not include money taken from customers or store personnel.)

16 17–21
1 ☐ Yes – How much? $ _______
2 ☐ No – *Go to 5b*

b. Did the robber take any merchandise, equipment, or supplies? (Do not include personal property taken from customers or store personnel.)

22 23–27
1 ☐ Yes – What was the total value? $ _______
2 ☐ No – *Skip to 6a*

c. How was the value determined?

28
1 ☐ Original cost
2 ☐ Replacement cost
3 ☐ Other – *Specify* _______

Refer to item 3a, part II. If either box 3 or 4 is marked, do NOT ask 6a but mark box 2 or 3 respectively, then continue with item 6b.

6a. How much, if any, of your loss was recovered by insurance?

29–33
$ _______
1 ☐ None
2 ☐ Does not have insurance
3 ☐ Don't know

b. How much, if any, of your loss was recovered by means other than insurance?

34–38
$ _______ – *Go to 6c*
1 ☐ None } *Skip to 7a*
2 ☐ Don't know }

c. How was it recovered? (For example, returned by the police.)

____

7a. Was a weapon used when your (this) business was robbed?

39
1 ☐ Yes – *Go to 7b*
2 ☐ No – *Skip to 8a*

b. What was the weapon?

40
1 ☐ Gun
2 ☐ Knife
3 ☐ Other – *Specify* _______

8a. Were you or any of the employees injured in this robbery seriously enough to require medical attention?

41 42–46
1 ☐ Yes – How many? _______ – *Go to 8b*
2 ☐ No – *Skip to 9*

b. How many of them were hospitalized?

47–48
Number _______

9. Did you or any of the employees lose any days from work due to injuries resulting from this robbery?

49 50–52
1 ☐ Yes – How many days? _______
2 ☐ No

10. Was this robbery reported to the police?

53 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

11. Was (were) the robber(s) caught?

54 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 3 ☐ Don't know

12. How many robbers were involved in this incident?

55–56 Number _______

13. To your knowledge, what were the characteristics of the robber(s) in terms of sex, race, and age?

Offender characteristics			Number of persons per robbery incident
SEX	Male	57	
	Female	58	
RACE	White	59	
	Negro	60	
	Other	61	
AGE	Teenager	62	
	20 – 30	63	
	30 – 50	64	
	50 or older	65	

REMINDER:* *Be sure to go back to part I and ask item 9.

SAMPLE

APPENDIX III

DETAILED DATA TABLES

The appendix tables for the pilot survey of victimization have been divided into five main sections: A, Characteristics of Victims; B, Characteristics of Incidents; C, Characteristics of Household Property Crime Victims; D, Characteristics of Household Incidents; and E, Characteristics of Commercial Crimes. All of the tables in these sections contain data for calendar year 1970. Dayton tables and San Jose tables are separate but appear in pairs, except for Table 54, where they are combined.

The figures in the tables were estimated from an area-wide probability sample of households and businesses and have been properly inflated to represent the entire geographic area surveyed (see the sample design discussion in Appendix I for a description of the area covered in each city).

Statistically unreliable estimates have been replaced with an asterisk in the tables. Thresholds below which the inflated values of the number of sample cases are unreliable are as follows:

	Sections A–D Individuals and households			Section E Commercial establishment
	Total	Low-income areas	Non-low-income areas	
Dayton	300	200	350	200
San Jose	500	350	650	200

Similarly, percentages incorporating values below these estimates are replaced with asterisks also. These thresholds, in each instance, represent fewer than 10 sample cases on the average.

It should be noted that this survey was largely experimental in nature and was designed as a prototype of the National Crime Panel (NCP). For that reason many of the data displays in the appendix are prototypical of tables that will be tabulated and published annually in the NCP. In addition, a large body of new data elements, as well as revised classification categorizations, are being readied for the NCP. For those tables in this report that will be replicated in the NCP annual summary, the number of corresponding NCP cells replaced with an asterisk will be minimal because of the vastly larger sample size being used in the National Crime Panel as opposed to the modest sample sizes used for San Jose and Dayton.

GUIDE TO TABLES

Section A. Characteristics of victims (Tables 1-14)

Section A provides socioeconomic and demographic data about people who were victims of crimes involving personal contact with the offender, i.e., robbery, assault (including rape), and/or personal larceny (purse snatching and pocket picking). The characteristics presented

in these tables include the victim's sex, age, race or ethnic origin, education, marital status, and area of residence.

The data in Section A show not only the number and percentage of persons who have been victimized one or more times by personal crime, but also the number and percentage of persons who have been victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crime. The basic concept of persons victimized one or more times during a given reference period does not account for multiple victimizations against the same person during that period. Therefore, the number of persons victimized one or more times by a given type of crime is less than the number of victims for that same type of crime. Note that corresponding counts of the number of victims of specific crimes can be found in Tables 15-18 of Section B, Characteristics of Incidents.

The percentages in the Section A tables give an indication of the frequency with which various subgroups of the population are victimized. It should be noted, however, that the actual probability of victimization is a function of the exposure to the risk of victimization. Shut-ins, for example, are rarely if ever exposed to the risk of street robbery.

The percentage victimized was computed for each category of personal crime by dividing the specified relevant population into the number of persons victimized one or more times by that type of crime. For example, the percentage of adult males victimized one or more times by robbery was obtained by dividing the number of adult males victimized by robbery by the total adult male population.

Section B. Characteristics of incidents (Tables 15-34)

Section B describes personal crimes (robbery, assault, and personal larceny) in terms of the incident itself and, in some instances, the effect of the incident upon each of the victims involved. Since there may be more than one victim in the same incident of personal crime, the number of victims of a specific crime is always equal to or greater than the number of incidents of that crime. Thus, Tables 15-18 present data based on the number of victims and Tables 19-34 present data based on the number of incidents.

Data in Tables 15-18 are, in effect, victim-event counts and take account of differences that may exist between multiple victims of the same incident. For example, each victim in a multiple-victim incident may have a different relationship to the offender(s), the amount of work time lost by each victim may vary, and the dollar loss suffered by each victim may differ.

Data in Tables 19-34 provide information on the incident, such as the perceived characteristics of the offender(s) and the circumstances surrounding the event, including the time and place of occurrence, the number of victims involved, the type of weapon used by the offender(s), and the police reporting status. Most of this information is displayed separately for incidents of stranger-to-stranger personal crime. Note that the number of incidents of each type of crime may be more or less than the number of persons victimized, depending upon the joint effect of multiple victims in the same incident and multiple victimizations against the same person.

Section C. Characteristics of household property crime victims (Tables 35-39)

Section C provides socioeconomic and demographic data about households that were victims of property crime, i.e., victims of burglary, larceny, and/or auto theft. It is presumed that a household property crime affects all members of a household equally; therefore, the data in this section characterize an entire household rather than an individual. The characteristics presented in these tables include the race or ethnic origin of the head of the household, the family income, the owner-renter status, and the area of residence.

The data in Section C show the number and percentage of households that have been victimized one or more times by various forms of property crime. For household property crimes, information about the offender and his characteristics is infrequently available to the victim and hence was not ascertained in

the survey. Moreover, personal contact between the offender and the victim during the actual commission of the crime is not possible in household property crime, by definition. The concept, therefore, of stranger-to-stranger household property crime is a virtually meaningless one. There are no tables in Section C, therefore, that correspond to the stranger-to-stranger tables of Section A. It is assumed that only one household is involved in a given incident (unlike personal crimes, which can involve more than one victim); therefore the number of households victimized one or more times is always less than the number of incidents of household crime (counts of incidents appearing in Section D).

The percentages show the frequency with which households possessing certain characteristics are victimized. Like personal victimization, the actual probability of property victimization is affected somewhat by exposure to risk. For example, households with elaborate security devices are presumably less subject to burglary than those with little or no security measures.

The percentages were computed for each category of property crime by dividing the specified relevant population into the number of households victimized one or more times by that type of crime. For example, the percentage of renter households victimized one or more times by burglary was obtained by dividing the number of renter households victimized by burglary by the total number of renter households.

Section D. Characteristics of household incidents (Tables 40-45)

Section D provides information on the circumstances surrounding the occurrence of a property crime incident. By the counting rule adopted, only one household may be involved in a given incident, and the entire household, including all members, is considered the victim; therefore, the number of victims (i.e., households) of property crime is the same as the number of incidents.

Data available in this section for each type of property crime include the time and place of occurrence, the police reporting status, the amount of loss and percent recovered, the cost of damages and who paid for repairs, and the number of times a household was victimized by a property crime in 1970.

Section E. Characteristics of commercial crimes (Tables 46-59)

Section E contains all the data relevant to the commercial crimes of burglary and robbery. As with households, it is assumed that only one business is involved in a given incident; hence, the number of incidents of commercial crime, shown in Tables 46-54, is always greater than the number of businesses victimized one or more times, shown in Tables 55-59.

Data in Tables 46-49 display the characteristics of businesses with incidents of burglary and/or robbery. These characteristics include type of business, employment size, amount of receipts, and location of business.

Data in Tables 47-54 provide information on the burglary or robbery incident such as the time of occurrence, the police reporting status, the amount of loss and percent recovered by insurance, the number of offenders involved and apprehended, and the type of weapon used by the offender.

Data in Tables 55-59 show the number and percentage of businesses victimized one or more times by commercial crime. The percentages show the probability with which businesses possessing certain characteristics are victimized. These characteristics include type of business, employment size, amount of receipts, and location of business.

The percentages were computed for each category of commercial crime by dividing the specified relevant population into the number of businesses victimized one or more times by the type of crime. For example, the percentage of manufacturing businesses victimized one or more times by robbery was obtained by

dividing the number of manufacturing businesses victimized by robbery by the total number of manufacturing businesses.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

This section describes the operating definitions of terms used in the tables in Appendix III of this report. Where unusual terminology is employed, additional explanatory notes are given. The order in which terms are defined is generally the order in which they appear in the appendix tables.

I. Types of crimes

A. Personal crimes: crimes, including attempted or completed robbery, assault, and personal larceny during which the victim is present (see Sections A and B, Tables 1-34).

1. Robbery: an offender uses force, violence, or threats to deprive or try to deprive the victim of his property. (Commercial robberies are treated separately; see "C. Commercial crimes.")

   a. Strong-arm robbery: a weaponless offender takes the victim's property or cash by threatening or attacking the victim.

      (1) Without assault: committed by threatening without actually attacking or injuring the victim.

      (2) With assault: committed by attacking the victim in a manner that could or does result in injury.

   b. Armed robbery: an offender with a weapon takes the victim's property or cash.

      (1) Without assault: committed by threatening without actually attacking or injuring the victim.

      (2) With assault: committed by attacking the victim in a manner that could or does result in injury.

   c. Purse snatch with force: a weaponless offender takes a purse from the victim's person by attacking the victim in a manner that could or does result in injury.

   d. Attempted strong-arm robbery: a weaponless offender tries but fails to take the victim's property or cash by threatening the victim with harm or by attacking the victim in a manner that could or does result in injury.

   e. Attempted armed robbery: an offender with a weapon tries but fails to take the victim's property.

   f. Attempted purse snatch with force: a weaponless offender tries but fails to take the victim's purse by attacking the victim in a manner that could or does result in injury.

2. Assault: an offender unlawfully attacks or attempts to attack the victim.

   a. Aggravated assault: an unlawful attack in which the victim either receives some injury from an offender with a weapon or is seriously injured by a weaponless offender.

      (1) Bodily injury with a weapon: the victim receives either minor injuries (bruises, black eye, small cuts, scratches, swellings) or serious injuries (knocked unconscious, broken bones or teeth, internal injury) from an offender with a weapon.

      (2) Severe injury without a weapon: a weaponless offender injures the victim seriously.

   b. Simple assault: a weaponless offender attacks the victim in a manner that does result in minor

injuries or could but does not result in some injury.

c. Attempted assault: the victim is attacked but not injured by an offender with a weapon or is threatened with harm by an offender with or without a weapon.

(1) With weapon: an attempted assault committed by an offender with a weapon.

(2) Without weapon: an attempted assault committed by a weaponless offender.

d. Rape: an offender forces, threatens, or intimidates the victim into having sexual intercourse against the victim's will.

e. Attempted rape: an offender threatens or tries but fails to force a victim to have sexual intercourse against the victim's will.

3. Personal larceny: an offender deprives or tries to deprive the victim of property on his person without using a weapon or threatening or attacking the victim.

a. Pocket picking: an offender takes cash or wallet from the victim's person without attacking, threatening, or using a weapon.

b. Other personal larceny: includes purse snatch without force, i.e. without attack, threat, or use of weapon; attempted purse snatch without force; and attempted pocket picking.

B. Property crimes: includes burglary, larceny, auto theft, and crimes in which the offender takes or tries to take something belonging to a person who is absent or does not come into contact with the offender during the incident. (See Sections C and D, Tables 35-45.)

1. Burglary: an offender illegally enters or attempts to enter a structure (house, apartment, room, barn, garage, shed) with or without taking something from the structure. (Commercial burglaries are treated separately; see "C. Commercial crimes.")

a. Forcible entry: an offender actually enters a structure by using force (evidenced by a broken window, jimmied lock, slashed screen, etc.).

b. Unlawful entry: an offender actually enters without force a structure in which he has no legal right to be.

c. Attempted forcible entry: an offender tries but fails to enter a structure by using force.

2. Larceny: an offender takes or tries to take the personal property of the victim (excluding auto theft, pocket picking, and purse snatch without force), such as items outside the home or inside a car, car accessories, or personal belongings in a building open to the public.

a. Petty larceny: an offender takes property valued at less than $50.

b. Grand larceny: an offender takes property valued at $50 or more.

c. Attempted larceny: an offender tries but fails to deprive the victim of his personal property.

3. Auto theft: an offender takes or tries to take the victim's motor vehicle (any self-propelled vehicle that runs on the road, not on rails, such as a car, truck, bus, motorcycle, motor scooter, etc.).

a. Car theft: a car is taken by a stranger or taken and not returned by someone the car owner knew (relative, friend, employee, etc.).

b. Other motor vehicle theft: a motor vehicle (excluding a car) is taken by a stranger or taken and not returned by someone the owner knew.

c. Attempted auto theft: an offender tries but fails to take a car or other motor vehicle.

C. Commercial crimes: crimes, including robberies and burglaries, in which an offender takes or tries to take money and/or property from a business or other commercial establishment, association, or organization (see also IV. Types of business establishments). (See Section E, Tables 46-59.)

1. Robbery: an offender uses violence or threats to force the owner or an employee of a business or other commercial establishment to give up property belonging to it.

2. Attempted robbery: an offender uses violence or threats to try to force the owner or an employee of a business or other commercial establishment to give up property belonging to it.

3. Burglary: an offender breaks into or illegally enters a business or other commercial establishment, whether or not something is taken, including incidents in which the offender hides in the establishment during closing, then breaks out.

4. Attempted burglary: an offender tries but fails to break into or illegally enter a place of business or other commercial establishment.

II. Other crime terms used

A. Victimized: refers to the number or percentage of units (persons, households, or businesses) with one or more crimes (personal, property, or commercial, respectively) during all of 1970. Therefore, because of multiple crimes against the same victim, figures for crimes in the Appendix III table columns labeled "number of persons (or households or businesses) victimized" and the percentages based on these figures are not additive. The multiple victim is counted only once in each subtotal or total; therefore, the total victimized one or more times will likely be less than the totals shown in the individual categories and subcategories of crime. The number of persons victimized one or more times also may be more or less than the number of incidents of crime. It was assumed that only one household or business was involved in each incident; therefore the number victimized was always less than the number of incidents.

B. Incident: the occurrence of a criminal event. An incident may involve multiple victims (e.g., a street holdup of two persons who are together). Similarly, the same individual can be a victim of several incidents throughout the year. Personal victimizations of employees during commercial robberies are discounted in the personal crimes sector to minimize duplicate counting of incidents.

C. Victim: a person, household, or commercial establishment reporting a victimization experience. In the personal crimes area, several victims may be involved in the same incident.

D. Stranger-to-stranger personal crimes: robberies, assaults (including rape), and personal larcenies in which the victim reported not knowing the offender or offenders or not knowing if the offender was a stranger, or in which the relationship between victim and offender was not ascertained.

E. Recovered: concerning personal or property crimes, refers to stolen property and/or cash returned (by the police, the offender, or someone else) or replaced by an insurance company, including cash settlements; for commercial crimes, refers to insurance company settlements only.

F. Other weapons: other than a gun or knife, anything used to injure or attempt to injure the victim seriously (e.g., razor, hatchet, ax, scissors, broken bottle or glass, brick, jack

handle, tire iron, explosives, acid, lye, poison).

G. Property damage: a term referring only to the damage incurred during the forced entry of a building, not to merchandise or possessions damaged but not taken, clothing damaged during an assault, car damages incurred during a theft of objects from within the car, etc.

H. Time of occurrence: daytime (6 a.m. to 6 p.m.); evening (6 p.m. to midnight); night (midnight to 6 a.m.).

I. Place of occurrence: "In or near own home" includes the yard, the sidewalk, and the garage or other buildings on the property. "Street/park/field" includes playgrounds, parking lots, or any outdoor place not "near own home." "School/store/office" means inside any commercial building, factory, or warehouse. "Elsewhere" means inside a public conveyance or station; home of a friend, relative, or neighbor; vacation home; or any other place not listed above.

III. Other general terms

A. Race or color: determined by the interviewer as white, black, or other by observation. For persons not present during the interview and not related to the household head, race was obtained by asking the respondent. Persons whose parents were of different races were considered to be of the same race as the father. "Other" includes persons whose origin is oriental, American Indian, Eskimo, etc. Persons of Spanish origin are white unless they consider themselves to be black or other.

B. Ethnic origin: a person's statement of his origin or descent; determined by the lineage of a person's ancestors and not by religion. Persons whose parents were of different origins were considered to be of the same ethnic origin as the father.

C. Education: the highest grade of regular schooling attended, excluding specialized schools offering no credit toward a high school diploma or academic degree.

D. Low-income area: designates those census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes. The low-income threshold is a variable dependent upon family size, presence and number of family members younger than 18, sex of head, farm-nonfarm residence, and, in the case of one- and two-person families, age of head. The tracts that comprise the San Jose and Dayton low-income areas are, for the most part, geographically contiguous and contain about 13 percent of the population. For this survey, the tracts designated for inclusion were delineated before the 1970 Census was completed. The following sets of tracts may differ slightly from those constructed as a result of the Decennial Census: 5001-5020, 5031.01-5031.03, 5036.02, 5037.01, 5037.03, and 5051 (Santa Clara County); 0001, 0017-0019, 0025-0034, 0038-0040, 0045, 0046, 0062, and 0065 (Montgomery County). (For more information on the income thresholds and how they vary by demographic characteristics, see *General Social and Economic Characteristics, Final Report PC (1)-C1 United States Summary;* U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970; pp. App. 29-31.)

E. Family: two or more persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption living together in a household.

F. Family income: the income of the household head plus that of all family members living at home during the past 12 months, including wages or salary, net income from business or farm, pensions, dividends, interest, rent, child support, unemployment or

workmen's compensation, public assistance, or regular gifts; excluding insurance payments, lump-sum inheritances, or proceeds of the sale of a house, car, or other personal property.

G. Household: all persons who occupy a housing unit, whether a person living alone, a family, or persons unrelated to each other sharing a housing unit.

H. Housing unit: a house, apartment, or room used as separate living quarters whose occupants live and eat separately from everyone else in the building and have either direct access through a common hall or complete and private kitchen facilities.

I. Marital status: "married" includes persons who state they have a common-law marriage and persons parted temporarily for reasons other than marital discord (employment, armed services, etc.). "Separated" includes married persons who have a legal separation or have parted because of marital discord, but not those temporarily separated for other reasons. "Never married" includes those whose only marriage has been annulled and those living together who do not mention common-law marriage.

IV. Types of business establishments

A. Manufacturing: establishments primarily engaged in the mechanical or chemical transformation of substances into new products. These establishments are commonly described as plants, factories, or mills and characteristically use power-driven machines and material-handling equipment.

B. Real estate: a business such as a realty firm, apartment building, commercial building, rental agency, real estate holding company, etc.

C. Retail and wholesale: "retail" refers to any establishment open to the general public that sells goods primarily to individuals for their own use, such as a food or general merchandise store, auto dealer, service station, furniture and appliance store, eating and drinking place, drugstore, liquor store, bookstore, sporting goods store, etc. "Wholesale" refers to an establishment selling goods to other businesses for resale to consumers or selling goods to business or industrial clients for their own use, such as a bulk oil dealer, office equipment and furniture dealer, terminal grain elevator, etc.

D. Service: businesses primarily engaged in providing services to other businesses or in providing professional services, lodging, personal or repair services, or amusement or recreation facilities to the general public, such as a hotel, motel, barber or beauty shop, dry cleaner, funeral home, advertising agency, equipment or vehicle rental agency, auto or other repair service, theater, bowling alley, health service (doctor, hospital, etc.), nongovernmental educational service, law firm, engineering service, accounting service, etc.

E. Other: includes agricultural services that operate from a business location or office (nurseries, landscape architects, veterinarians); communications activities (telegraph and telephone companies, TV and radio stations); construction businesses (general contractors such as home, road, and bridge builders and special trade contractors such as electrical, plumbing, and painting firms); utilities and sanitary services (electric power, natural gas, water, refuse collection); finance and credit services (credit unions, small loan companies, savings and loan associations); insurance activities (insurance agencies, insurance home offices, insurance claims services); transportation services (railroads, buses, household goods movers, truck freight haulers, steamship lines, airlines); mineral extraction businesses (oil wells, rock quarries, gravel pits, and coal mines); auxiliary business locations (administrative offices, warehouses, and garages); and organizations operated on a non-profit basis (professional associations, civic and social associations, and religious and charitable organizations).

APPENDIX III

DETAILED DATA TABLES

Section A: Characteristics of victims

DAYTON

Table 1. Number and percent of persons 16 and older victimized by personal crimes, by sex (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total		Male		Female	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	16,310	4.2	10,800	5.9	5,510	2.7
Robbery	3,180	0.8	2,040	1.1	1,150	0.5
Strong-arm	950	0.2	600	0.3	350	0.1
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	730	0.1	510	0.2	*	*
Armed	1,170	0.3	880	0.4	*	*
Without assault	490	0.1	350	0.1	*	*
With assault	710	0.1	550	0.3	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	610	0.1	360	0.2	*	*
Attempted armed	410	0.1	300	0.1	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	12,230	3.1	8,440	4.6	3,790	1.8
Aggravated	1,760	0.4	1,260	0.7	500	0.2
Bodily injury with weapon	1,460	0.3	1,180	0.6	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	300	0.0	*	*	*	*
Simple	3,610	0.9	2,220	1.2	1,390	0.6
Attempted assault	7,640	1.9	5,570	3.0	2,070	1.0
With weapon	4,700	1.2	3,550	1.9	1,150	0.5
Without weapon	3,070	0.7	2,110	1.1	950	0.4
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,690	0.4	870	0.4	820	0.4
Pocket picking	1,440	0.3	770	0.4	670	0.3
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 1. Number and percent of persons 16 and older victimized by personal crimes, by sex (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total		Male		Female	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Number of population victimized
Total	28,290	4.1	18,880	5.8	9,410	2.6
Robbery	4,890	0.7	3,210	0.9	1,670	0.4
Strong-arm	1,220	0.1	650	0.1	570	0.1
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	840	0.1	*	*	*	*
Armed	1,270	0.1	920	0.2	*	*
Without assault	770	0.1	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	1,060	0.1	540	0.1	530	0.1
Attempted armed	1,450	0.2	1,200	0.3	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	22,190	3.2	14,720	4.5	7,470	2.1
Aggravated	2,450	0.3	1,870	0.5	580	0.1
Bodily injury with weapon	2,110	0.3	1,640	0.5	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	7,620	1.1	4,510	1.3	3,110	0.8
Attempted assault	13,180	1.9	9,380	2.8	3,800	1.0
With weapon	7,700	1.1	5,490	1.6	2,210	0.6
Without weapon	5,970	0.8	4,310	1.3	1,660	0.4
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	660	0.0	*	*	510	0.1
Personal larceny	2,330	0.3	1,620	0.4	710	0.2
Pocket picking	2,150	0.3	1,500	0.4	640	0.1
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 2. Number and percent of persons 16 and older victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by sex (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total		Male		Female	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	11,090	2.8	7,780	4.3	3,310	1.6
Robbery	2,650	0.6	1,850	1.0	800	0.3
Strong-arm	780	0.2	560	0.3	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	600	0.1	470	0.2	*	*
Armed	1,060	0.2	820	0.4	*	*
Without assault	460	0.1	350	0.1	*	*
With assault	620	0.1	480	0.2	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	480	0.1	360	0.2	*	*
Attempted armed	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	7,220	1.8	5,440	3.0	1,780	0.8
Aggravated	1,020	0.2	830	0.4	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	890	0.2	790	0.4	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	2,040	0.5	1,380	0.7	660	0.3
Attempted assault	4,320	1.1	3,480	1.9	840	0.4
With weapon	2,800	0.7	2,360	1.3	440	0.2
Without weapon	1,570	0.4	1,160	0.6	400	0.1
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,590	0.4	840	0.4	750	0.3
Pocket picking	1,350	0.3	750	0.4	600	0.2
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 2. Number and percent of persons 16 and older victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by sex (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total		Male		Female	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	20,160	2.9	14,280	4.3	5,880	1.6
Robbery	4,050	0.6	2,710	0.8	1,340	0.3
Strong-arm	790	0.1	570	0.1	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	710	0.1	*	*	*	*
Armed	890	0.1	570	0.1	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	1,020	0.1	540	0.1	*	*
Attempted armed	1,370	0.2	1,130	0.3	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	14,290	2.1	10,430	3.2	3,860	1.1
Aggravated	1,680	0.2	1,320	0.4	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,520	0.2	1,170	0.3	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	4,470	0.6	3,250	0.9	1,220	0.3
Attempted assault	8,480	1.2	6,370	1.9	2,110	0.6
With weapon	5,600	0.8	4,000	1.2	1,600	0.4
Without weapon	3,130	0.4	2,560	0.7	580	0.1
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	2,330	0.3	1,620	0.4	710	0.2
Pocket picking	2,150	0.3	1,500	0.4	640	0.1
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 3. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by age (1970)

Type of personal crime	Age 16–24		Age 25–39		Age 40–64		Age 65 and older	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	7,530	8.5	4,020	3.8	3,980	2.6	780	1.9
Robbery	1,080	1.2	640	0.6	1,000	0.6	470	1.1
Strong-arm	*	*	*	*	350	0.2	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Armed	*	*	*	*	440	0.2	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted armed	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	6,470	7.3	3,390	3.2	2,240	1.5	*	*
Aggravated	980	1.1	390	0.3	370	0.2	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	910	1.0	*	*	*	*	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	2,120	2.3	1,010	0.9	470	0.3	*	*
Attempted assault	4,000	4.5	2,090	1.9	1,450	0.9	*	*
With weapon	2,860	3.2	1,140	1.0	680	0.4	*	*
Without weapon	1,240	1.4	950	0.9	800	0.5	*	*
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	480	0.5	*	*	860	0.5	*	*
Pocket picking	440	0.4	*	*	720	0.4	*	*
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 3. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by age[1] (1970)

Type of personal crime	Age 16–24		Age 25–39		Age 40–64	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	13,770	8.5	8,960	4.0	5,080	2.1
Robbery	2,590	1.6	1,360	0.6	840	0.3
Strong-arm	*	*	550	0.2	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Armed	740	0.4	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attampted strong-arm	690	0.4	*	*	*	*
Attempted armed	870	0.5	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	10,790	6.7	7,460	3.3	3,690	1.5
Aggravated	1,580	0.9	540	0.2	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,420	0.8	*	*	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	4,360	2.7	2,280	1.0	920	0.3
Attempted assault	5,790	3.6	4,750	2.1	2,510	1.0
With weapon	3,430	2.1	2,940	1.3	1,200	0.5
Without weapon	2,630	1.6	2,030	0.9	1,320	0.5
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,230	0.7	*	*	510	0.2
Pocket picking	1,120	0.6	*	*	510	0.2
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]For persons 65 and older the number victimized was too small for each personal crime to be shown separately. The total number of persons 65 and older victimized was 480, and the rate was 0.8 percent.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 4. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by age (1970)

Type of personal crime	Age 16–24		Age 25–39		Age 40–64		Age 65 and older	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	4,850	5.4	2,510	2.3	3,070	2.0	670	1.6
Robbery	760	0.8	490	0.4	950	0.6	440	1.0
Strong-arm	*	*	*	*	350	0.2	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Armed	*	*	*	*	420	0.2	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	320	0.3	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted armed	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	3,860	4.3	1,940	1.8	1,370	0.9	*	*
Aggravated	670	0.7	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	630	0.7	*	*	*	*	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	1,140	1.2	600	0.5	300	0.2	*	*
Attempted assault	2,190	2.4	1,210	1.1	880	0.5	*	*
With weapon	1,760	1.9	700	0.6	350	0.2	*	*
Without weapon	470	0.5	520	0.4	540	0.3	*	*
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	480	0.5	*	*	790	0.5	*	*
Pocket picking	440	0.4	*	*	650	0.4	*	*
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 4. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by age[1] (1970)

Type of personal crime	Age 16–24		Age 25–39		Age 40–64	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	10,370	6.4	5,620	2.5	3,750	1.5
Robbery	2,280	1.4	990	0.4	690	0.2
Strong-arm	*	*	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Armed	510	0.3	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	650	0.4	*	*	*	*
Attempted armed	870	0.5	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	7,390	4.5	4,190	1.9	2,520	1.0
Aggravated	1,120	0.6	*	*	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,040	0.6	*	*	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	2,850	1.7	1,010	0.4	550	0.2
Attempted assault	3,770	2.3	2,670	1.2	1,960	0.8
With weapon	2,500	1.5	1,960	0.8	1,080	0.4
Without weapon	1,380	0.8	860	0.3	890	0.3
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,230	0.7	*	*	510	0.2
Pocket picking	1,120	0.6	*	*	510	0.2
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]For persons 65 and older the number victimized was too small for each personal crime to be shown separately. The total number of persons 65 and older victimized was 420, and the rate was 0.7 percent.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 5. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by race[1] (1970)

Type of personal crime	White		Black	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	13,440	4.0	2,750	5.3
Robbery	2,320	0.7	860	1.6
Strong-arm	690	0.2	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*
With assault	520	0.1	*	*
Armed	810	0.2	360	0.6
Without assault	*	*	*	*
With assault	520	0.1	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	460	0.1	*	*
Attempted armed	300	0.0	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Assault	10,570	3.2	1,630	3.1
Aggravated	1,500	0.4	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,220	0.3	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*
Simple	3,110	0.9	500	0.9
Attempted assault	6,640	2.0	960	1.8
With weapon	4,060	1.2	640	1.2
Without weapon	2,660	0.8	360	0.7
Rape	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,160	0.3	440	0.8
Pocket picking	940	0.2	420	0.8
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]For other races the number of persons victimized was too small to be statistically reliable.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 5. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by race or ethnic origin[1] (1970)

Type of personal crime	White[2]		Black		Mexican or other Spanish	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	24,240	4.1	670	6.4	3,020	5.1
Robbery	4,060	0.6	*	*	590	1.0
Strong-arm	960	0.1	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	580	0.1	*	*	*	*
Armed	980	0.1	*	*	*	*
Without assault	630	0.1	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	970	0.1	*	*	*	*
Attempted armed	1,170	0.2	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	19,150	3.2	520	4.9	2,280	3.9
Aggravated	2,130	0.3	*	*	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,830	0.3	*	*	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	6,500	1.1	*	*	1,020	1.7
Attempted assault	11,460	1.9	*	*	1,150	1.9
With weapon	6,900	1.1	*	*	520	0.8
Without weapon	5,000	0.8	*	*	630	1.0
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	660	0.1	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	2,170	0.3	*	*	*	*
Pocket picking	1,980	0.3	*	*	*	*
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]Data for other races are excluded because of an insignificant number of sample cases and because race or ethnic origin was not ascertained in an estimated six-tenths of 1 percent of the total cases.

[2]Excluding persons of Mexican and other Spanish origin.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 6. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by race[1] (1970)

Type of personal crime	White		Black	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	9,270	2.8	1,700	3.2
Robbery	1,960	0.5	690	1.3
Strong-arm	550	0.1	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*
With assault	430	0.1	*	*
Armed	730	0.2	330	0.6
Without assault	*	*	*	*
With assault	460	0.1	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	390	0.1	*	*
Attempted armed	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Assault	6,520	1.9	660	1.2
Aggravated	950	0.2	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	830	0.2	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*
Simple	1,890	0.5	*	*
Attempted assault	3,840	1.1	450	0.8
With weapon	2,490	0.7	310	0.5
Without weapon	1,390	0.4	*	*
Rape	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,090	0.3	420	0.8
Pocket picking	870	0.2	390	0.7
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1] For other races the number of persons victimized was too small for each personal crime to be shown separately. The total number of persons of other races victimized was 120, and the rate was 3.5 percent.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 6. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by race or ethnic origin[1] (1970)

Type of personal crime	White[2]		Mexican or other Spanish	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	17,150	2.9	2,270	3.9
Robbery	3,330	0.5	*	*
Strong-arm	620	0.1	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*
Armed	670	0.1	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	930	0.1	*	*
Attempted armed	1,090	0.1	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Assault	12,210	2.0	1,610	2.7
Aggravated	1,440	0.2	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,290	0.2	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*
Simple	3,670	0.6	790	1.3
Attempted assault	7,420	1.2	660	1.1
With weapon	5,030	0.8	*	*
Without weapon	2,650	0.4	*	*
Rape	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	2,170	0.3	*	*
Pocket picking	1,980	0.3	*	*
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]The number of blacks victimized was too small for each personal crime to be shown separately. The total number of blacks victimized was 470, and the rate was 4.5 percent.

[2]Excluding persons of Mexican and other Spanish origin.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 7. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by level of education[1] (1970)

Type of personal crime	Elementary school education or less		Attended high school		Attended college	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	2,610	4.3	11,030	4.7	2,610	2.8
Robbery	680	1.1	2,150	0.9	350	0.3
Strong-arm	*	*	760	0.3	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	590	0.2	*	*
Armed	300	0.4	620	0.2	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	440	0.1	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	*	*	550	0.2	*	*
Attempted armed	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	1,520	2.5	8,480	3.6	2,180	2.3
Aggravated	*	*	1,090	0.4	360	0.3
Bodily injury with weapon	*	*	830	0.3	320	0.3
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	470	0.7	2,800	1.2	330	0.3
Attempted assault	1,030	1.7	5,040	2.1	1,510	1.6
With weapon	780	1.2	3,250	1.4	650	0.7
Without weapon	*	*	1,900	0.8	850	0.9
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	610	1.0	880	0.3	*	*
Pocket picking	520	0.8	740	0.3	*	*
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]An estimated one-half of 1 percent of the total cases are excluded from the detail because the level of education was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 7. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by level of education[1] (1970)

Type of personal crime	Elementary school education or less		Attended high school		Attended college	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	1,400	2.2	16,230	4.8	10,430	3.9
Robbery	*	*	2,740	0.8	1,770	0.6
Strong-arm	*	*	790	0.2	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Armed	*	*	700	0.2	530	0.2
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	*	*	620	0.1	*	*
Attempted armed	*	*	670	0.1	540	0.2
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	1,040	1.6	12,890	3.8	8,110	3.0
Aggravated	*	*	1,420	0.4	870	0.3
Bodily injury with weapon	*	*	1,120	0.3	840	0.3
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	*	*	4,640	1.3	2,720	1.0
Attempted assault	690	1.0	7,490	2.2	4,930	1.8
With weapon	*	*	4,350	1.2	2,860	1.0
Without weapon	*	*	3,370	1.0	2,330	0.8
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	*	*	1,310	0.3	860	0.3
Pocket picking	*	*	1,240	0.3	740	0.2
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1] An estimated 1.6 percent of the total cases are excluded from the detail because the level of education was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 8. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by level of education[1] (1970)

Type of personal crime	Elementary school education or less		Attended high school		Attended college	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	2,030	3.3	7,230	3.1	1,780	1.9
Robbery	600	0.9	1,710	0.7	350	0.3
Strong-arm	*	*	590	0.2	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	460	0.2	*	*
Armed	*	*	540	0.2	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	370	0.1	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	*	*	440	0.1	*	*
Attempted armed	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	950	1.5	4,900	2.1	1,310	1.4
Aggravated	*	*	620	0.2	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	*	*	500	0.2	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	340	0.5	1,470	0.6	*	*
Attempted assault	620	1.0	2,830	1.2	820	0.9
With weapon	470	0.7	1,990	0.8	310	0.3
Without weapon	*	*	880	0.3	510	0.5
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	610	1.0	830	0.3	*	*
Pocket picking	520	0.8	700	0.3	*	*
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1] An estimated one-half of 1 percent of the total case are excluded from the detail because the level of educatio was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable num bers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 8. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by level of education[1] (1970)

Type of personal crime	Elementary school education or less		Attended high school		Attended college	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	1,010	1.5	11,120	3.3	7,880	2.9
Robbery	*	*	2,250	0.6	1,430	0.5
Strong-arm	*	*	510	0.1	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Armed	*	*	510	0.1	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	*	*	620	0.1	*	*
Attempted armed	*	*	600	0.1	540	0.2
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	640	1.0	7,900	2.3	5,670	2.1
Aggravated	*	*	1,000	0.2	510	0.1
Bodily injury with weapon	*	*	850	0.2	510	0.1
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	*	*	2,640	0.7	1,640	0.6
Attempted assault	*	*	4,470	1.3	3,630	1.3
With weapon	*	*	2,980	0.8	2,250	0.8
Without weapon	*	*	1,570	0.4	1,570	0.5
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	*	*	1,310	0.3	860	0.3
Pocket picking	*	*	1,240	0.3	740	0.2
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1] An estimated 1.6 percent of the total cases are excluded from the detail because the level of education was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 9. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by marital status[1] (1970)

Type of personal crime	Married		Widowed, separated or divorced		Never married	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	6,800	2.6	3,160	6.1	6,280	8.7
Robbery	1,350	0.5	760	1.4	1,070	1.4
Strong-arm	380	0.1	*	*	380	0.5
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	300	0.4
Armed	490	0.1	370	0.7	310	0.4
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	*	*	*	*	360	0.5
Attempted armed	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	5,210	2.0	2,030	3.9	4,950	6.8
Aggravated	710	0.2	370	0.7	670	0.9
Bodily injury with weapon	610	0.2	*	*	610	0.8
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	970	0.3	780	1.5	1,850	2.5
Attempted assault	3,740	1.4	1,070	2.0	2,830	3.9
With weapon	2,110	0.8	690	1.3	1,900	2.6
Without weapon	1,660	0.6	410	0.8	990	1.3
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	470	0.1	610	1.1	580	0.8
Pocket picking	400	0.1	470	0.9	540	0.7
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1] An estimated four-tenths of 1 percent of the total cases are excluded from the detail because the marital status was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 9. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by marital status[1] (1970)

Type of personal crime	Married		Widowed, separated or divorced		Never married	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	13,280	2.0	3,770	4.7	10,810	7.7
Robbery	2,060	0.4	*	*	2,280	1.6
Strong-arm	530	0.1	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Armed	520	0.1	*	*	710	0.5
Without assault	*	*	*	*	470	0.3
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	520	0.1	*	*	*	*
Attempted armed	520	0.1	*	*	750	0.5
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	10,450	2.3	3,190	4.0	8,280	5.9
Aggravated	950	0.2	*	*	1,040	0.7
Bodily injury with weapon	760	0.1	*	*	1,040	0.7
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	2,630	0.5	1,570	1.9	3,380	2.4
Attempted assault	7,090	1.5	1,400	1.7	4,630	3.3
With weapon	3,890	0.8	990	1.2	2,740	1.9
Without weapon	3,410	0.7	*	*	2,150	1.5
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,170	0.2	*	*	870	0.6
Pocket picking	1,090	0.2	*	*	760	0.5
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1] An estimated seven-tenths of 1 percent of the total cases are excluded from the detail because the marital status was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 10. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by marital status[1] (1970)

Type of personal crime	Married		Widowed, separated or divorced		Never married	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	4,780	1.8	1,980	3.8	4,260	5.9
Robbery	1,160	0.4	560	1.1	930	1.2
Strong-arm	340	0.1	*	*	300	0.4
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Armed	470	0.1	*	*	310	0.4
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	*	*	*	*	300	0.4
Attempted armed	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	3,220	1.2	960	1.8	2,990	4.1
Aggravated	340	0.1	*	*	510	0.7
Bodily injury with weapon	300	0.1	*	*	470	0.6
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	750	0.2	350	0.6	940	1.3
Attempted assault	2,120	0.8	570	1.1	1,640	2.2
With weapon	1,220	0.4	340	0.6	1,240	1.7
Without weapon	890	0.3	*	*	450	0.6
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	470	0.1	530	1.0	560	0.7
Pocket picking	400	0.1	400	0.7	510	0.7
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1] An estimated four-tenths of 1 percent of the total cases are excluded from the detail because the marital status was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 10. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by marital status[1] (1970)

Type of personal crime	Married		Widowed, separated or divorced		Never married	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Numqer of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	9,550	2.1	1,750	2.1	8,430	6.0
Robbery	1,560	0.3	*	*	2,120	1.5
Strong-arm	*	*	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Armed	*	*	*	*	550	0.3
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted armed	*	*	*	*	750	0.5
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	6,980	1.5	1,170	1.4	5,860	4.2
Aggravated	670	0.1	*	*	720	0.5
Bodily injury with weapon	520	0.1	*	*	720	0.5
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	1,540	0.3	*	*	2,390	1.7
Attempted assault	4,860	1.0	610	0.7	2,940	2.1
With weapon	2,840	0.6	610	0.7	2,080	1.4
Without weapon	2,160	0.4	*	*	970	0.6
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,170	0.2	*	*	870	0.6
Pocket picking	1,090	0.2	*	*	760	0.5
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]An estimated seven-tenths of 1 percent of the total cases are excluded from the detail because the marital status was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 11. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by area of residence (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total county		Low-income area[1]		Remainder of county	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	16,310	4.2	3,150	7.4	13,160	3.8
Robbery	3,180	0.8	1,220	2.8	1,970	0.5
Strong-arm	950	0.2	280	0.6	660	0.1
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	730	0.1	230	0.5	490	0.1
Armed	1,170	0.3	580	1.3	590	0.1
Without assault	490	0.1	280	0.6	*	*
With assault	710	0.1	320	0.7	380	0.1
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	610	0.1	*	*	460	0.1
Attempted armed	410	0.1	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	12,230	3.1	1,610	3.8	10,630	3.1
Aggravated	1,760	0.4	310	0.7	1,450	0.4
Bodily injury with weapon	1,460	0.3	270	0.6	1,190	0.3
Severe injury without weapon	300	0.0	*	*	*	*
Simple	3,610	0.9	490	1.1	3,120	0.9
Attempted assault	7,640	1.9	890	2.1	6,750	1.9
With weapon	4,700	1.2	600	1.4	4,100	1.2
Without weapon	3,070	0.7	330	0.7	2,730	0.8
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,690	0.4	520	1.2	1,160	0.3
Pocket picking	1,440	0.3	410	0.9	1,030	0.3
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-income area" in Glossary.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 11. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by area of residence (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total county		Low-income area[1]		Remainder of county	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	28,290	4.1	3,840	5.0	24,450	4.0
Robbery	4,890	0.7	1,010	1.3	3,880	0.6
Strong-arm	1,220	0.1	360	0.4	850	0.1
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	840	0.1	360	0.4	*	*
Armed	1,270	0.1	*	*	940	0.1
Without assault	770	0.1	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	1,060	0.1	*	*	800	0.1
Attempted armed	1,450	0.2	*	*	1,330	0.2
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	22,190	3.2	2,800	3.6	19,400	3.2
Aggravated	2,450	0.3	*	*	2,110	0.3
Bodily injury with weapon	2,110	0.3	*	*	1,880	0.3
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	7,620	1.1	820	1.0	6,800	1.1
Attempted assault	13,180	1.9	1,970	2.5	11,210	1.8
With weapon	7,700	1.1	880	1.1	6,810	1.1
Without weapon	5,970	0.8	1,130	1.4	4,850	0.8
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	660	0.1	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	2,330	0.3	410	0.5	1,920	0.3
Pocket picking	2,150	0.3	370	0.4	1,770	0.2
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-income area" in Glossary.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 12. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by area of residence—inside Dayton (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total city		Low-income area[1]		Remainder of city	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	10,330	6.0	3,150	7.5	7,180	5.6
Robbery	2,640	1.5	1,220	2.8	1,420	1.1
Strong-arm	770	0.4	*	*	490	0.3
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	600	0.3	*	*	370	0.2
Armed	1,000	0.5	580	1.3	430	0.3
Without assault	360	0.2	*	*	*	*
With assault	660	0.3	320	0.7	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	520	0.3	*	*	380	0.2
Attempted armed	330	0.1	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	7,200	4.2	1,610	3.8	5,590	4.3
Aggravated	1,100	0.6	310	0.7	780	0.6
Bodily injury with weapon	1,010	0.5	*	*	740	0.5
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	2,130	1.2	490	1.1	1,640	1.2
Attempted assault	4,580	2.6	890	2.1	3,700	2.8
With weapon	2,950	1.7	600	1.4	2,350	1.8
Without weapon	1,720	1.0	330	0.7	1,390	1.0
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,150	0.6	520	1.2	630	0.4
Pocket picking	990	0.5	410	0.9	580	0.4
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-income area" in Glossary.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 12. Number and percent of persons victimized by personal crimes, by area of residence—inside San Jose (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total city		Low-income area[1]		Remainder of city	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	11,980	4.3	3,530	5.1	8,450	4.0
Robbery	2,640	0.9	970	1.4	1,670	0.8
Strong-arm	810	0.2	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	660	0.2	*	*	*	*
Armed	740	0.2	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	690	0.2	*	*	*	*
Attempted armed	580	0.2	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	8,980	3.2	2,480	3.6	6,500	3.1
Aggravated	730	0.2	*	*	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	690	0.2	*	*	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	3,280	1.1	790	1.1	2,490	1.2
Attempted assault	5,520	2.0	1,770	2.6	3,750	1.8
With weapon	3,030	1.1	850	1.2	2,190	1.0
Without weapon	2,760	1.0	960	1.4	1,800	0.8
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	930	0.3	410	0.6	*	*
Pocket picking	890	0.3	370	0.5	*	*
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-income area" in Glossary.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 13. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by area of residence (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total county		Low-income area[1]		Remainder of county	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	11,090	2.8	2,200	5.2	8,890	2.5
Robbery	2,650	0.6	1,060	2.5	1,590	0.4
Strong-arm	780	0.2	280	0.6	490	0.1
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	600	0.1	230	0.5	370	0.1
Armed	1,060	0.2	510	1.2	550	0.1
Without assault	460	0.1	250	0.6	*	*
With assault	620	0.1	280	0.6	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	480	0.1	*	*	390	0.1
Attempted armed	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	7,220	1.8	780	1.8	6,440	1.8
Aggravated	1,020	0.2	*	*	890	0.2
Bodily injury with weapon	890	0.2	*	*	770	0.2
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	2,040	0.5	*	*	1,850	0.5
Attempted assault	4,320	1.1	500	1.1	3,830	1.1
With weapon	2,800	0.7	330	0.7	2,470	0.7
Without weapon	1,570	0.4	*	*	1,400	0.4
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,590	0.4	470	1.1	1,120	0.3
Pocket picking	1,350	0.3	360	0.8	990	0.2
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-income area" in Glossary.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 13. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by area of residence (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total county		Low-income area[1]		Remainder of county	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	20,160	2.9	2,750	3.6	17,410	2.9
Robbery	4,050	0.6	850	1.1	3,200	0.5
Strong-arm	790	0.1	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	710	0.1	*	*	*	*
Armed	890	0.1	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	1,020	0.1	*	*	800	0.1
Attempted armed	1,370	0.2	*	*	1,250	0.2
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	14,290	2.1	1,690	2.2	12,600	2.1
Aggravated	1,680	0.2	*	*	1,520	0.2
Bodily injury with weapon	1,520	0.2	*	*	1,370	0.2
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	4,470	0.6	450	0.5	4,020	0.6
Attempted assault	8,480	1.2	1,100	1.4	7,380	1.2
With weapon	5,600	0.8	590	0.7	5,010	0.8
Without weapon	3,130	0.4	550	0.7	2,590	0.4
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	2,330	0.3	410	0.5	1,920	0.3
Pocket picking	2,150	0.3	370	0.4	1,770	0.2
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-income area" in Glossary.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 14. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by area of residence—inside Dayton (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total city		Low-income area[1]		Remainder of city	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	7,140	4.1	2,200	5.2	4,930	3.8
Robbery	2,280	1.3	1,060	2.5	1,220	0.9
Strong-arm	650	0.3	280	0.6	370	0.2
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	520	0.3	230	0.5	*	*
Armed	900	0.5	510	1.2	380	0.3
Without assault	340	0.2	250	0.6	*	*
With assault	580	0.3	280	0.6	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	440	0.2	*	*	350	0.2
Attempted armed	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	4,080	2.4	780	1.8	3,300	2.5
Aggravated	640	0.3	*	*	520	0.4
Bodily injury with weapon	640	0.3	*	*	520	0.4
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	1,000	0.5	*	*	810	0.6
Attempted assault	2,600	1.5	500	1.1	2,100	1.6
With weapon	1,780	1.0	330	0.7	1,450	1.1
Without weapon	820	0.4	*	*	650	0.5
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,100	0.6	470	1.1	630	0.4
Pocket picking	940	0.5	360	0.8	580	0.4
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-income area" in Glossary.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 14. Number and percent of persons victimized by stranger-to-stranger personal crimes, by area of residence—inside San Jose (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total city		Low-income area[1]		Remainder of city	
	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized	Number of persons victimized	Percent of population victimized
Total	8,470	3.0	2,590	3.8	5,880	2.8
Robbery	2,300	0.8	850	1.2	1,450	0.6
Strong-arm	570	0.2	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	570	0.2	*	*	*	*
Armed	590	0.2	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	650	0.2	*	*	*	*
Attempted armed	580	0.2	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	5,530	2.0	1,540	2.2	4,000	1.9
Aggravated	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	1,830	0.6	450	0.6	1,390	0.6
Attempted assault	3,290	1.1	980	1.4	2,310	1.1
With weapon	2,060	0.7	550	0.8	1,510	0.7
Without weapon	1,270	0.4	460	0.6	800	0.3
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	930	0.3	410	0.6	*	*
Pocket picking	890	0.3	370	0.5	*	*
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of persons victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A person victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-income area" in Glossary.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

Section B. Characteristics of incidents

DAYTON

Table 15. Personal crimes by relationship of victim to the offender(s) (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total victims[1]	Victim recognized none[2]				Victim recognized one or more		
		Total	One offender	Multiple offenders	Don't know number	Total	One offender	Multiple offenders
Total	21,330	13,210	5,440	6,340	1,430	8,120	6,270	1,850
Robbery	3,600	2,910	1,110	1,680	*	680	*	400
Strong-arm	950	770	*	450	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	730	600	*	350	*	*	*	*
Armed	1,190	1,080	*	770	*	*	*	*
Without assault	490	460	*	300	*	*	*	*
With assault	710	620	*	470	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	680	560	390	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted armed	500	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	15,960	8,620	3,950	4,060	610	7,340	5,890	1,450
Aggravated	1,880	1,050	*	690	*	830	680	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,540	930	*	650	*	610	460	*
Severe injury without weapon	340	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	4,320	2,300	1,220	1,030	*	2,030	1,660	370
Attempted assault	9,470	5,120	2,310	2,320	490	4,350	3,480	870
With weapon	5,590	3,210	1,470	1,320	420	2,380	1,740	640
Without weapon	3,880	1,920	850	1,000	*	1,970	1,740	*
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,770	1,680	380	600	700	*	*	*
Pocket picking	1,480	1,380	*	440	650	*	*	*
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

[1]The unit of count is the victim, not the incident. The number of victims was used because a given incident may involve multiple victims, each of whom may have had a different relationship to the offender(s).

[2]Includes victims who reported they did not know the offender(s), victims who reported they did not know if the offender was a stranger, and victims whose relationship to the offender was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 15. Personal crimes by relationship of victim to the offender(s) (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total victims[1]	Victim recognized none[2]				Victim recognized one or more		
		Total	One offender	Multiple offenders	Don't know number	Total	One offender	Multiple offenders
Total	33,810	22,680	11,410	9,250	2,020	11,130	8,520	2,610
Robbery	5,060	4,130	1,800	2,330	*	920	*	*
Strong-arm	1,220	790	*	*	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	840	710	*	*	*	*	*	*
Armed	1,270	890	*	*	*	*	*	*
Without assault	770	580	*	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	500	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	1,060	1,020	570	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted armed	1,450	1,370	590	780	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	26,160	15,970	9,000	6,440	530	10,200	8,070	2,130
Aggravated	2,640	1,680	1,080	600	*	970	540	*
Bodily injury with weapon	2,230	1,520	920	600	*	710	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	8,200	4,650	2,730	1,920	*	3,550	3,210	*
Attempted assault	14,660	9,150	4,860	3,760	530	5,510	4,140	1,370
With weapon	8,420	5,980	3,120	2,400	*	2,440	1,640	800
Without weapon	6,240	3,180	1,740	1,370	*	3,070	2,500	570
Rape	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	660	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	2,590	2,590	620	*	1,490	*	*	*
Pocket picking	2,150	2,140	620	*	1,290	*	*	*
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

[1]The unit of count is the victim, not the incident. The number of victims was used because a given incident may involve multiple victims, each of whom may have had a different relationship to the offender(s).

[2]Includes victims who reported they did not know the offender(s), victims who reported they did not know if the offender was a stranger, and victims whose relationship to the offender was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 16. Assaults and robberies by amount of work time lost by victim (1970)

Robberies and assaults	Total victims[1]	No lost time	Some lost time	Not employed
Total	19,560	13,120	2,160	3,990
Robbery	3,600	2,030	590	870
Strong-arm	950	630	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*
With assault	730	560	*	*
Armed	1,190	610	*	360
Without assault	490	340	*	*
With assault	710	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	680	420	*	*
Attempted armed	500	340	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Assault	15,960	11,090	1,560	3,130
Aggravated	1,880	730	730	420
Bodily injury with weapon	1,540	730	540	*
Severe injury without weapon	340	*	*	*
Simple	4,320	2,460	390	1,450
Attempted assault	9,470	7,770	*	1,250
With weapon	5,590	4,570	*	700
Without weapon	3,880	3,200	*	550
Rape	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*

[1]The unit of count is the victim, not the incident. The number of victims was used because a given incident may involve multiple victims, each of whom may have lost varying amounts of time from work. Detail may not add to totals because of a small number of cases in which the time lost was not determined, or because of rounding.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 16. Assaults and robberies by amount of work time lost by victim (1970)

Robberies and assaults	Total victims[1]	No lost time	Some lost time	Not employed
Total	31,220	24,000	2,560	4,430
Robbery	5,060	4,110	*	680
Strong-arm	1,220	960	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*
With assault	840	660	*	*
Armed	1,270	880	*	*
Without assault	770	610	*	*
With assault	500	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	1,060	910	*	*
Attempted armed	1,450	1,370	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Assault	26,160	19,890	2,290	3,750
Aggravated	2,640	1,630	*	590
Bodily injury with weapon	2,230	1,600	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*
Simple	8,200	5,830	790	1,590
Attempted assault	14,660	11,960	1,090	1,380
With weapon	8,420	6,630	940	740
Without weapon	6,240	5,330	*	640
Rape	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	660	*	*	*

[1]The unit of count is the victim, not the incident. The number of victims was used because a given incident may involve multiple victims, each of whom may have lost varying amounts of time from work. Detail may not add to totals because of a small number of cases in which the time lost was not determined, or because of rounding.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 17. Robbery and personal larceny (excluding attempts) by amount of loss (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total victims[1]	Loss less than $10	Loss of $10-249	Loss of $250 or more
Total	4,000	480	2,960	450
Robbery	2,420	*	1,890	320
Strong-arm	950	*	780	*
Armed	1,190	*	900	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,580	300	1,070	*

[1]The unit of count is the victim, not the incident. The number of victims was used because a given incident may involve multiple victims, each of whom may have suffered varying dollar loss. The sum of the detail may not add to the total because of a small number of cases in which the amount of loss was not determined, or because of rounding.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 17. Robbery and personal larceny (excluding attempts) by amount of loss[1] (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total victims[2]	Loss less than $10	Loss of $10-249
Total	4,700	1,090	2,860
Robbery	2,550	630	1,170
Strong-arm	1,220	*	*
Armed	1,270	*	610
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*
Personal larceny	2,150	*	1,680

[1]The number of persons with losses of $250 or more was too small to be shown separately.

[2]The unit of count is the victim, not the incident. The number of victims was used because a given incident may involve multiple victims, each of whom may have suffered varying dollar loss. The sum of the detail may not add to the total because of a small number of cases in which the amount of loss was not determined, or because of rounding.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 18. Number of persons victimized by robbery and assault, by number of times (1970)

Victims of robbery and/or assault	Total number of persons victimized[1]	Persons victimized once	Persons victimized twice	Persons victimized three or more times
Total	14,600	11,810	1,870	910
Victims of robbery[2] (only)	2,530	2,490	*	*
Victims of robbery with assault (only)	1,740	1,710	*	*
Victims of robbery without assault (only)	800	780	*	*
Victims of assault (only)	11,610	9,320	1,530	760

[1]"Victims of robbery with assault (only)" and "Victims of robbery without assault (only)" will not add to the total in most cases because of persons who were victims of both robbery with assault and robbery without assault.

[2]An incident of crime involving both robbery and assault is classified as a robbery.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 18. Number of persons victimized by robbery and assault, by number of times (1970)

Victims of robbery and/or assault	Total number of persons victimized[1]	Persons victimized once	Persons victimized twice	Persons victimized three or more times
Total	25,470	21,510	3,160	800
Victims of robbery[2] (only)	3,740	3,650	*	*
Victims of robbery with assault (only)	2,050	1,960	*	*
Victims of robbery without assault (only)	1,690	1,690	*	*
Victims of assault (only)	20,650	17,870	2,340	*
Victims of robbery and assault	1,080	*	740	*

[1]"Victims of robbery with assault (only)" and "Victims of robbery without assault (only)" will not add to the total in most cases because of persons who were victims of both robbery with assault and robbery without assault.

[2]An incident of crime involving both robbery and assault is classified as a robbery.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 19. Personal crimes by place of occurrence (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents[1]	In or near own home	Street/park/ field	School/store/ office	Elsewhere
Total	17,880	3,500	6,790	4,550	2,800
Robbery	3,200	540	1,970	430	*
Strong-arm	920	*	590	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	730	*	480	*	*
Armed	1,020	*	570	*	*
Without assault	400	*	*	*	*
With assault	620	*	420	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	580	*	320	*	*
Attempted armed	430	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	12,980	2,820	4,240	3,480	2,270
Aggravated	1,440	310	580	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,170	*	530	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	3,620	850	1,110	880	700
Attempted assault	7,630	1,600	2,460	2,340	1,160
With weapon	4,300	710	1,680	1,020	820
Without weapon	3,330	890	780	1,320	340
Rape	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,700	*	580	630	350
Pocket picking	1,440	*	450	530	320
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

[1] An estimated 1.3 percent of the total cases are excluded from the detail because the place of occurrence was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 19. Personal crimes by place of occurrence (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents[1]	In or near own home	Street/park/ field	School/store/ office	Elsewhere
Total	28,840	5,610	10,650	5,600	6,300
Robbery	3,990	540	1,980	*	880
Strong-arm	1,000	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	700	*	*	*	*
Armed	810	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	860	*	*	*	*
Attempted armed	1,250	*	700	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	22,330	5,000	8,070	4,310	4,690
Aggravated	2,320	600	1,050	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,980	*	980	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	7,410	2,030	2,200	1,740	1,350
Attempted assault	12,010	2,170	4,550	2,200	2,900
With weapon	6,550	1,160	2,930	940	1,330
Without weapon	5,460	1,010	1,620	1,260	1,570
Rape	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	2,510	*	610	840	730
Pocket picking	2,150	*	*	800	620
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

[1] An estimated 2.4 percent of the total cases are excluded from the detail because the place of occurrence was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 20. Personal crimes by time of occurrence (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents[1]	Day (6 a.m.–6 p.m.)	Evening and night		
			Total	6 p.m.–midnight	Midnight–6 a.m.
Total	17,880	6,510	11,040	8,640	2,400
Robbery	3,200	1,020	2,100	1,690	410
Strong-arm	920	300	620	500	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	730	*	480	390	*
Armed	1,020	300	670	470	*
Without assault	400	*	*	*	*
With assault	620	*	340	350	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	580	*	340	*	*
Attempted armed	430	*	340	310	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	12,980	4,820	8,000	6,120	1,880
Aggravated	1,440	470	980	730	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,170	380	790	650	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	3,620	1,330	2,240	1,700	540
Attempted assault	7,630	2,980	4,530	3,600	930
With weapon	4,300	1,170	3,040	2,420	620
Without weapon	3,330	1,810	1,490	1,180	310
Rape	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,700	670	950	840	*
Pocket picking	1,440	510	870	750	*
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*

[1]Detail may not add to totals because of rounding or because of 320 cases in which the time of occurrence was not determined.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 20. Personal crimes by time of occurrence (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents[1]	Day (6 a.m.–6 p.m.)	Evening and night		
			Total	6 p.m.–midnight	Midnight–6 a.m.
Total	28,840	13,360	14,330	12,040	2,290
Robbery	3,990	1,540	2,340	2,070	*
Strong-arm	1,000	*	730	730	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	700	*	*	*	*
Armed	810	*	650	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	860	550	*	*	*
Attempted armed	1,250	600	660	650	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	22,330	10,480	11,050	9,220	1,830
Aggravated	2,320	750	1,480	1,150	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,980	670	1,220	1,000	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	7,410	3,400	2,750	2,940	810
Attempted assault	12,010	5,970	5,580	4,900	680
With weapon	6,550	3,270	2,990	2,630	*
Without weapon	5,460	2,700	2,590	2,270	*
Rape	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	590	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	2,510	1,340	940	750	*
Pocket picking	2,150	1,150	840	680	*
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*

[1] Detail may not add to totals because of rounding or because of 320 cases in which the time of occurrence was not determined.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 21. Personal crimes by total number of victims involved (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	One victim	Two or more victims	Number of victims not determined
Total	17,880	15,420	1,820	650
Robbery	3,200	2,840	*	*
Strong-arm	920	870	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*
With assault	730	700	*	*
Armed	1,020	920	*	*
Without assault	400	370	*	*
With assault	620	550	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	580	440	*	*
Attempted armed	430	380	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Assault	12,980	11,300	1,480	*
Aggravated	1,440	1,220	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,170	980	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*
Simple	3,620	3,230	380	*
Attempted assault	7,630	6,560	920	*
With weapon	4,300	3,480	690	*
Without weapon	3,330	3,080	*	*
Rape	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,700	1,290	*	380
Pocket picking	1,440	1,090	*	330
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 21. Personal crimes by total number of victims involved (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	One victim	Two or more victims	Number of victims not determined
Total	28,840	24,210	2,800	1,830
Robbery	3,990	3,260	650	*
Strong-arm	1,000	820	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*
With assault	700	590	*	*
Armed	810	550	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	860	680	*	*
Attempted armed	1,250	1,140	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Assault	22,330	19,370	2,090	870
Aggravated	2,320	2,000	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,980	1,750	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*
Simple	7,410	6,610	550	*
Attempted assault	12,010	10,210	1,260	550
With weapon	6,550	5,260	800	*
Without weapon	5,460	4,940	*	*
Rape	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	590	550	*	*
Personal larceny	2,510	1,580	*	870
Pocket picking	2,150	1,390	*	750
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 22. Stranger-to-stranger personal crimes by total number of victims involved (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	One victim	Two or more victims	Number of victims not determined
Total	10,770	9,030	1,240	500
Robbery	2,590	2,280	*	*
Strong-arm	750	700	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*
With assault	600	570	*	*
Armed	940	850	*	*
Without assault	380	350	*	*
With assault	560	500	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	470	360	*	*
Attempted armed	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Assault	6,580	5,560	960	*
Aggravated	710	530	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	640	490	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*
Simple	1,810	1,530	*	*
Attempted assault	3,910	3,340	550	*
With weapon	2,390	1,990	400	*
Without weapon	1,520	1,350	*	*
Rape	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,600	1,190	*	380
Pocket picking	1,350	1,000	*	330
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 22. Stranger-to-stranger personal crimes by total number of victims involved (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	One victim	Two or more victims	Number of victims not determined
Total	18,990	15,100	2,140	1,760
Robbery	3,330	2,710	520	*
Strong-arm	610	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*
With assault	570	*	*	*
Armed	660	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	820	640	*	*
Attempted armed	1,170	1,070	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*
Assault	13,150	10,800	1,550	800
Aggravated	1,410	1,150	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,300	1,080	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*
Simple	4,040	3,350	*	*
Attempted assault	7,300	5,940	880	*
With weapon	4,710	3,690	550	*
Without weapon	2,590	2,260	*	*
Rape	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	2,510	1,580	*	870
Pocket picking	2,150	1,390	*	750
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in Introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 23. Person reporting offense to police by type of personal crime (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents[1]	Total reported to police	Reported by		Not reported to police
			Victim	Someone else	
Total	17,880	9,300	6,930	2,370	8,570
Robbery	3,200	2,430	2,000	430	760
Strong-arm	920	740	600	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	730	570	420	*	*
Armed	1,020	870	750	*	*
Without assault	400	300	300	*	*
With assault	620	570	450	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	580	310	*	*	*
Attempted armed	430	270	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	12,980	6,110	4,270	1,840	6,860
Aggravated	1,440	1,030	620	410	420
Bodily injury with weapon	1,170	810	490	320	360
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	3,620	1,720	1,130	590	1,900
Attempted assault	7,630	3,210	2,360	840	4,410
With weapon	4,300	2,050	1,390	660	2,250
Without weapon	3,330	1,160	970	*	2,160
Rape	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,700	760	660	*	940
Pocket picking	1,440	630	540	*	810
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*

[1]Detail may not add to totals because of rounding or because of a small number of cases in which the reporting status was not available.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 23. Person reporting offense to police by type of personal crime (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents[1]	Total reported to police	Reported by		Not reported to police
			Victim	Someone else	
Total	28,840	11,190	8,260	2,930	17,430
Robbery	3,990	1,890	1,250	630	2,110
Strong-arm	1,000	*	*	*	620
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	700	*	*	*	*
Armed	810	520	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	860	*	*	*	*
Attempted armed	1,250	540	*	*	710
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	22,330	8,470	6,230	2,240	13,710
Aggravated	2,320	1,280	870	*	1,040
Bodily injury with weapon	1,980	1,130	760	*	850
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	7,410	2,510	1,760	740	4,820
Attempted assault	12,010	4,380	3,290	1,090	7,560
With weapon	6,550	2,780	2,130	650	3,700
Without weapon	5,460	1,600	1,160	*	3,860
Rape	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	590	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	2,510	830	790	*	1,620
Pocket picking	2,150	830	790	*	1,250
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*

[1]Detail may not add to totals because of rounding or because of a small number of cases in which the reporting status was not available.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 24. Person reporting offense to police by type of stranger-to-stranger personal crime (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	Total reported to police	Reported by		Not reported to police
			Victim	Someone else	
Total	10,770	6,080	4,660	1,420	4,690
Robbery	2,590	2,040	1,670	370	550
Strong-arm	750	660	510	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	600	530	390	*	*
Armed	940	780	660	*	*
Without assault	380	*	*	*	*
With assault	560	500	380	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	470	*	*	*	*
Attempted armed	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	6,580	3,300	2,350	950	3,280
Aggravated	710	520	300	*	*
Bodily injury with weapon	640	490	300	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	1,810	850	520	330	960
Attempted assault	3,910	1,870	1,470	400	2,040
With weapon	2,390	1,290	940	340	1,100
Without weapon	1,520	580	520	*	930
Rape	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	1,600	740	640	*	870
Pocket picking	1,350	610	510	*	740
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 24. Person reporting offense to police by type of stranger-to-stranger personal crime (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents[1]	Total reported to police	Reported by		Not reported to police
			Victim	Someone else	
Total	18,990	7,740	5,750	2,000	11,100
Robbery	3,330	1,590	1,020	560	1,750
Strong-arm	610	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	570	*	*	*	*
Armed	660	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	820	*	*	*	*
Attempted armed	1,170	*	*	*	710
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	13,150	5,330	3,940	1,390	7,740
Aggravated	1,410	900	610	*	510
Bodily injury with weapon	1,300	820	530	*	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	4,040	1,480	1,070	*	2,560
Attempted assault	7,300	2,760	2,070	690	4,460
With weapon	4,710	1,860	1,340	520	2,770
Without weapon	2,590	900	730	*	1,690
Rape	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*
Personal larceny	2,510	830	790	*	1,620
Pocket picking	2,150	830	790	*	1,250
Other personal larceny	*	*	*	*	*

[1]Detail may not add to totals because of rounding or because of a small number of cases in which the reporting status was not determined.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 25. Assaults and robberies by type of weapon (1970)

Robberies and assaults	Total incidents	Gun	Knife	Other	No weapon
Total	16,180	2,810	1,450	2,730	9,180
Robbery	3,200	560	350	550	1,740
Strong-arm	920	*	*	*	920
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	730	*	*	*	730
Armed	1,020	450	*	330	*
Without assault	400	*	*	*	*
With assault	620	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	580	*	*	*	580
Attempted armed	430	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	12,980	2,250	1,100	2,190	7,440
Aggravated	1,440	*	310	720	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,170	*	310	720	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	3,620	*	*	*	3,620
Attempted assault	7,630	2,100	730	1,470	3,330
With weapon	4,300	2,100	730	1,470	*
Without weapon	3,330	*	*	*	3,330
Rape	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 25. Assaults and robberies by type of weapon (1970)

Robberies and assaults	Total incidents[1]	Gun	Knife	Other	No weapon
Total	26,320	2,420	3,070	5,100	15,650
Robbery	3,990	*	870	800	1,930
Strong-arm	1,000	*	*	*	1,000
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	700	*	*	*	700
Armed	810	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	860	*	*	*	860
Attempted armed	1,250	*	760	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	22,330	2,030	2,200	4,300	13,720
Aggravated	2,320	*	*	1,430	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,980	*	*	1,430	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	7,410	*	*	*	7,410
Attempted assault	12,010	1,780	1,820	2,880	5,460
With weapon	6,550	1,780	1,820	2,880	*
Without weapon	5,460	*	*	*	5,460
Rape	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	590	*	*	*	520

[1]Detail may not add to totals because of rounding or because of a small number of cases in which the use of a weapon was not determined.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 26. Stranger-to-stranger assaults and robberies by type of weapon (1970)

Robberies and assaults	Total incidents	Gun	Knife	Other	No weapon
Total	9,170	1,780	820	1,630	4,930
Robbery	2,590	440	*	480	1,420
Strong-arm	750	*	*	*	750
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	600	*	*	*	600
Armed	940	380	*	310	*
Without assault	380	*	*	*	*
With assault	560	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	470	*	*	*	470
Attempted armed	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	6,580	1,350	570	1,150	3,510
Aggravated	710	*	*	380	*
Bodily injury with weapon	640	*	*	380	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	1,810	*	*	*	1,810
Attempted assault	3,910	1,250	360	780	1,520
With weapon	2,390	1,250	360	780	*
Without weapon	1,520	*	*	*	1,520
Rape	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 26. Stranger-to-stranger assaults and robberies by type of weapon (1970)

Robberies and assaults	Total incidents[1]	Gun	Knife	Other	No weapon
Total	16,480	1,830	2,240	3,690	8,640
Robbery	3,330	*	790	740	1,500
Strong-arm	610	*	*	*	610
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	570	*	*	*	570
Armed	660	*	*	*	*
Without assault	*	*	*	*	*
With assault	*	*	*	*	*
Purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted strong-arm	820	*	*	*	820
Attempted armed	1,170	*	680	*	*
Attempted purse snatch with force	*	*	*	*	*
Assault	13,150	1,540	1,450	2,950	7,140
Aggravated	1,410	*	*	890	*
Bodily injury with weapon	1,300	*	*	890	*
Severe injury without weapon	*	*	*	*	*
Simple	4,040	*	*	*	4,040
Attempted assault	7,300	1,370	1,220	2,050	2,590
With weapon	4,710	1,370	1,220	2,050	*
Without weapon	2,590	*	*	*	2,590
Rape	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted rape	*	*	*	*	*

[1]Detail may not add to totals because of rounding or because of a small number of cases in which the use of a weapon was not determined.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 27. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of personal crime—lone offenders, by age (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents[1]	Age of offender		
		Less than 17	17–20	More than 20
Total	10,420	660	1,990	7,470
Robbery	1,270	*	320	750
Strong-arm	300	*	*	*
Armed	*	*	*	*
Other	730	*	*	*
Assault[2]	8,680	500	1,600	6,480
Aggravated	3,680	*	720	2,730
Simple	2,600	*	620	1,740
Attempted, without weapon	2,390	*	*	1,990
Personal larceny	470	*	*	*

[1]Detail may not add to totals because of rounding or because of 310 cases in which the age of the offender was not determined.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[2]Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

SAN JOSE

Table 27. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of personal crime—lone offenders, by age (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents[1]	Age of offender		
		Less than 17	17–20	More than 20
Total	17,420	1,210	3,150	12,520
Robbery	1,870	*	*	1,380
Strong-arm	540	*	*	510
Armed	*	*	*	*
Other	1,040	*	*	620
Assault[2]	14,940	1,040	2,550	11,060
Aggravated	5,540	520	580	4,210
Simple	5,530	*	990	4,040
Attempted, without weapon	3,880	*	970	2,790
Personal larceny	620	*	*	*

Note: The sum of incidents in tables 27 and 28 (personal crimes by lone offenders and multiple offenders) does not equal the total number of incidents of personal crime because an estimated seven-tenths of 1 percent of the total cases in which the number of offenders involved was unknown or not ascertained are excluded.

[1]Detail may not add to totals because of rounding or because of 520 cases in which the age of the offender was not determined.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[2]Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

DAYTON

Table 28. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of personal crime—multiple offenders, by age (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	Age of offenders		
		All less than 21	None less than 21	Mixed and don't know
Total	6,100	2,920	1,640	1,510
Robbery	1,810	740	560	500
Strong-arm	560	*	*	*
Armed	750	360	190	*
Other	500	*	*	*
Assault[1]	3,760	1,910	940	890
Aggravated	1,920	990	600	350
Simple	980	500	*	380
Attempted, without weapon	860	410	270	*
Personal larceny	540	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in Introduction to Appendix III.

[1]Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

SAN JOSE

Table 28. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of personal crime—multiple offenders, by age (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	Age of offenders		
		All less than 21	None less than 21	Mixed and don't know
Total	9,510	3,650	2,900	2,940
Robbery	2,120	690	650	780
Strong-arm	*	*	*	*
Armed	550	*	*	*
Other	1,160	530	*	*
Assault[1]	6,960	2,810	2,130	2,010
Aggravated	3,560	1,010	1,190	1,340
Simple	1,880	1,110	550	*
Attempted, without weapon	1,520	680	*	*
Personal larceny	*	*	*	*

Note: The sum of incidents in tables 27 and 28 (personal crimes by lone offenders and multiple offenders) does not equal the total number of incidents of personal crime because an estimated seven-tenths of 1 percent of the total cases in which the number of offenders involved was unknown or not ascertained are excluded, or because of rounding.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in Introduction to Appendix III.

[1]Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

DAYTON

Table 29. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of personal crime—lone offenders, by race (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents[1]	Race of offender	
		White	Black
Total	10,420	7,040	3,080
Robbery	1,270	380	770
Strong-arm	300	*	*
Armed	*	*	*
Other	730	*	430
Assault[2]	8,680	6,460	2,080
Aggravated	3,680	2,780	850
Simple	2,600	2,120	430
Attempted, without weapon	2,390	1,560	790
Personal larceny	470	*	*

Note: The sum of incidents in tables 29 and 30 (personal crimes by lone offenders and multiple offenders) does not equal the total number of incidents of personal crime because an estimated eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total cases in which the number of offenders was not determined are excluded.

[1]The sum of the detail may not equal the total because of rounding and because the number of offenders of other races was too small to be shown separately for each personal crime. The total number of lone offenders of other races (or of undetermined race) was 310

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[2]Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

SAN JOSE

Table 29. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of personal crime—lone offenders, by race (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	Race of offender		
		White[1]	Black	Other[2]
Total	17,420	10,600	1,760	5,060
Robbery	1,870	1,060	*	710
Strong-arm	540	*	*	*
Armed	*	*	*	*
Other	1,040	560	*	*
Assault[3]	14,940	9,430	1,300	4,210
Aggravated	5,540	3,170	670	1,700
Simple	5,530	3,750	*	1,520
Attempted, without weapon	3,880	2,510	*	1,000
Personal larceny	620	*	*	*

Note: The sum of incidents in tables 29 and 30 (personal crimes by lone offenders and multiple offenders) does not equal the total number of incidents of personal crime because an estimated seven-tenths of 1 percent of the total cases in which the number of offenders involved was unknown or not ascertained are excluded, or because of rounding.

[1]Excluding persons of Mexican or other Spanish origin.

[2]Includes offenders of other races, offenders of Mexican or other Spanish origin, and cases where the race of the offender was not ascertained. A separate tabulation was not made for lone offenders of Mexican or other Spanish origin; for multiple offenders, however, Mexican or other Spanish represented 28 percent of the "Other" category (see Table 30).

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[3]Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

DAYTON

Table 30. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of personal crime—multiple offenders, by race (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	Race of offenders		
		White	Black	Other[1]
Total	6,100	2,680	2,550	870
Robbery	1,810	390	1,210	*
Strong-arm	560	*	*	*
Armed	750	*	640	*
Other	500	*	*	*
Assault[2]	3,760	2,110	1,140	510
Aggravated	1,920	1,280	470	*
Simple	980	390	420	*
Attempted, without weapon	860	440	*	330
Personal larceny	540	*	*	*

Note: The sum of incidents in tables 29 and 30 (personal crimes by lone offenders and multiple offenders) does not equal the total number of incidents of personal crime because an estimated eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total cases in which the number of offenders involved was unknown or not ascertained are excluded, and because of rounding.

[1] Includes multiple offenders of other races, cases where all of the offenders were not of the same race, and cases where the race was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[2] Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

SAN JOSE

Table 30. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of personal crime—multiple offenders, by race (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	Race of offenders		
		White[1]	Black	Other[2]
Total	9,510	3,830	1,540	4,140
Robbery	2,120	540	690	890
Strong-arm	*	*	*	*
Armed	550	*	*	*
Other	1,160	*	*	*
Assault[3]	6,960	3,210	770	2,980
Aggravated	3,560	1,780	*	1,410
Simple	1,880	840	*	790
Attempted, without weapon	1,520	590	*	780
Personal larceny	*	*	*	*

Note: The sum of incidents in tables 29 and 30 (personal crimes by lone offenders and multiple offenders) does not equal the total number of incidents of personal crime because an estimated seven-tenths of 1 percent of the total cases in which the number of offenders involved was unknown or not ascertained are excluded, and because of rounding.

[1]Excluding persons of Mexican or other Spanish origin.

[2]Includes offenders of other races, offenders of Mexican or other Spanish origin, cases where all of the offenders were not of the same race, and cases where the race was not ascertained. A separate tabulation showed that Mexican or other Spanish represented 28 percent of the "Other" category.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[3]Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

DAYTON

Table 31. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of stranger-to-stranger personal crime—lone offenders, by age (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents[1]	Age of offender	
		17–20	More than 20
Total	4,610	660	3,330
Robbery	1,010	*	640
Strong-arm	*	*	*
Armed	*	*	*
Other	520	*	330
Assault[2]	3,230	410	2,550
Aggravated	1,450	*	1,190
Simple	1,040	*	680
Attempted, without weapon	730	*	680
Personal larceny	380	*	*

[1]The sum of the detail may not equal the total because of rounding and because the number of offenders younger than 17 or of undetermined age was too small to be shown separately for each personal crime. The total number of offenders younger than 17 was 310; the total of those of undetermined age was 310.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[2]Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

SAN JOSE

Table 31. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of stranger-to-stranger personal crime—lone offenders, by age (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents[1]	Age of offender		
		Less than 17	17–20	More than 20
Total	9,650	740	2,070	6,370
Robbery	1,450	*	*	960
Strong-arm	*	*	*	*
Armed	*	*	*	*
Other	920	*	*	*
Assault[2]	7,570	570	1,460	5,330
Aggravated	3,630	*	500	2,580
Simple	2,460	*	660	1,570
Attempted, without weapon	1,490	*	*	1,190
Personal larceny	620	*	*	*

Note: The sum of incidents in tables 31 and 32 (stranger-to-stranger personal crimes by lone offenders and multiple offenders) does not equal the total number of incidents of stranger-to-stranger personal crime because an estimated 1 percent of the total cases in which the number of offenders involved was unknown or not ascertained are excluded.

[1]The sum of the detail may not equal the total because of rounding and because of 450 cases in which the age of the offender was not determined.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[2]Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

DAYTON

Table 32. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of stranger-to-stranger personal crime—multiple offenders, by age (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	Age of offenders		
		All less than 21	None less than 21	Mixed and don't know
Total	4,800	2,340	1,210	1,250
Robbery	1,470	560	410	480
Strong-arm	430	*	*	*
Armed	670	340	*	*
Other	360	*	*	*
Assault[1]	2,800	1,500	650	650
Aggravated	1,370	710	450	*
Simple	720	410	*	*
Attempted, without weapon	710	380	*	*
Personal larceny	540	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[1]Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

SAN JOSE

Table 32. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of stranger-to-stranger personal crime—multiple offenders, by age (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	Age of offenders		
		All less than 21	None less than 21	Mixed and don't know
Total	7,450	2,940	2,510	1,980
Robbery	1,880	670	570	650
Strong-arm	*	*	*	*
Armed	*	*	*	*
Other	1,160	530	*	*
Assault[1]	5,140	2,120	1,820	1,180
Aggravated	2,540	780	910	830
Simple	1,570	860	550	*
Attempted, without weapon	1,020	*	*	*
Personal larceny	*	*	*	*

Note: The sum of incidents in tables 31 and 32 (stranger-to-stranger personal crimes by lone offenders and multiple offenders) does not equal the total number of incidents of stranger-to-stranger personal crime because an estimated 1 percent of the total cases in which the number of offenders involved was unknown or not ascertained are excluded. Detail may not add to totals because of rounding, also.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[1]Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

DAYTON

Table 33. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of stranger-to-stranger personal crime—lone offenders, by race (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	Race of offender[1]	
		White	Black
Total	4,610	2,730	1,620
Robbery	1,010	*	660
Strong-arm	*	*	*
Armed	*	*	*
Other	520	*	310
Assault[2]	3,230	2,380	750
Aggravated	1,450	1,090	310
Simple	1,040	900	*
Attempted, without weapon	730	380	350
Personal larceny	380	*	*

Note: The sum of incidents in tables 33 and 34 (stranger-to-stranger personal crimes by lone offenders and multiple offenders) does not equal the total number of incidents of stranger-to-stranger personal crime because an estimated 1 percent of the total cases in which the number of offenders involved was unknown or not ascertained are excluded. Detail may not add to totals because of rounding, also.

[1]The number of offenders of other races was too small to be statistically reliable.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[2]Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

SAN JOSE

Table 33. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of stranger-to-stranger personal crime—lone offenders, by race (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	Race of offender		
		White[1]	Black	Other[2]
Total	9,650	5,640	1,240	2,770
Robbery	1,450	790	*	*
Strong-arm	*	*	*	*
Armed	*	*	*	*
Other	920	*	*	*
Assault[3]	7,570	4,730	820	2,020
Aggravated	3,630	2,240	500	890
Simple	2,460	1,490	*	800
Attempted, without weapon	1,490	1,000	*	*
Personal larceny	620	*	*	*

Note: The sum of incidents in tables 33 and 34 (stranger-to-stranger personal crimes by lone offenders and multiple offenders) does not equal the total number of incidents of stranger-to-stranger personal crime because an estimated 1 percent of the total cases in which the number of offenders involved was unknown or not ascertained are excluded. Detail may not add to totals because of rounding, also.

[1]Excluding persons of Mexican or other Spanish origin.

[2]Includes offenders of other races, offenders of Mexican or other Spanish origin, and cases where the race of the offender was not ascertained. A separate tabulation was not made for lone offenders of Mexican or other Spanish origin; for multiple offenders, however, Mexican or other Spanish represented 32 percent of the "Other" category (see Table 34).

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[3]Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

DAYTON

Table 34. Perceived characteristics of offenders, by type of stranger-to-stranger personal crime—multiple offenders, by race (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	Race of offenders		
		White	Black	Other[1]
Total	4,800	2,110	2,040	650
Robbery	1,470	*	1,030	340
Strong-arm	430	*	*	*
Armed	670	*	570	*
Other	360	*	*	*
Assault[2]	2,800	1,690	800	310
Aggravated	1,370	1,000	300	*
Simple	720	340	300	*
Attempted, without weapon	710	350	*	*
Personal larceny	540	*	*	*

Note: The sum of incidents in tables 33 and 34 (stranger-to-stranger personal crimes by lone offenders and multiple offenders) does not equal the total number of incidents of stranger-to-stranger personal crime because an estimated 1 percent of the total cases in which the number of offenders involved was unknown or not ascertained are excluded. Detail may not add to totals because of rounding, also.

[1]Includes multiple offenders of other races, cases where all of the offenders were not of the same race, and cases where the race was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[2]Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

SAN JOSE

Table 34. Perceived characteristics of offenders by type of stranger-to-stranger personal crime—multiple offenders, by race (1970)

Type of personal crime	Total incidents	Race of offenders		
		White[1]	Black	Other[2]
Total	7,450	2,730	1,490	3,230
Robbery	1,880	500	640	740
Strong-arm	*	*	*	*
Armed	*	*	*	*
Other	1,160	*	*	*
Assault[3]	5,140	2,150	770	2,220
Aggravated	2,540	1,050	*	1,020
Simple	1,570	690	*	630
Attempted, without weapon	1,020	*	*	*
Personal larceny	*	*	*	*

Note: The sum of incidents in tables 33 and 34 (stranger-to-stranger personal crimes by lone offenders and multiple offenders) does not equal the total number of incidents of stranger-to-stranger personal crime because an estimated 1 percent of the total cases in which the number of offenders involved was unknown or not ascertained are excluded. Detail may not add to totals because of rounding, also.

[1]Excluding persons of Mexican or other Spanish origin.

[2]Includes offenders of other races, offenders of Mexican or other Spanish origin, cases where all of the offenders were not of the same race, and cases where the race was not ascertained. A separate tabulation showed that Mexican or other Spanish represented 32 percent of the "Other" category.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[3]Assault categories are subdivided into 1) aggravated, which includes serious injury or injury with a weapon, attempted assault with a weapon, rape, and attempted rape; 2) simple; and 3) attempted assault without a weapon.

Section C. Characteristics of household property crime victims

DAYTON

Table 35. Number and percent of households victimized by property crimes, by race of head of household (1970)

Type of property crime	Total[1]		White		Black	
	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized
Total	68,830	37.8	56,440	36.3	12,090	47.7
Burglary	22,250	12.2	16,480	10.6	5,560	21.9
Forcible entry	9,500	5.2	6,010	3.8	3,430	13.5
Nothing taken	2,280	1.2	1,900	1.2	380	1.4
Loss less than $10	420	0.2	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	1,310	0.7	820	0.5	450	1.7
Loss $50-99	1,240	0.6	780	0.5	460	1.8
Loss $100-249	1,650	0.9	790	0.5	860	3.4
Loss $250-499	1,280	0.7	460	0.2	800	3.1
Loss $500-999	1,350	0.7	560	0.3	790	3.1
Loss $1,000 or more	700	0.3	550	0.3	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	270	0.1	*	*	*	*
Unlawful entry	9,790	5.3	8,010	5.1	1,650	6.5
Nothing taken	2,070	1.1	1,870	1.2	*	*
Loss less than $10	1,270	0.6	1,100	0.7	*	*
Loss $10-49	2,770	1.5	2,250	1.4	480	1.9
Loss $50-99	1,690	0.9	1,330	0.8	370	1.4
Loss $100-249	1,860	1.0	1,460	0.9	380	1.5
Loss $250-499	460	0.2	420	0.2	*	*
Loss $500-999	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	300	0.1	*	*	*	*
Attempted forcible entry	4,710	2.5	3,560	2.2	1,100	4.3
Larceny	53,290	29.2	44,820	28.8	8,310	32.8
Petty	35,860	19.7	30,530	19.6	5,210	20.5
Loss less than $5	8,000	4.3	7,320	4.7	680	2.6
Loss $5-9	8,290	4.5	7,540	4.8	730	2.8
Loss $10-24	13,400	7.3	11,550	7.4	1,810	7.1
Loss $25-49	12,680	6.9	9,870	6.3	2,760	10.9
Grand	19,000	10.4	15,470	9.9	3,510	13.8
Loss $50-99	10,280	5.6	8,120	5.2	2,150	8.5
Loss $100-249	7,110	3.9	5,880	3.7	1,210	4.7
Loss $250-499	1,920	1.0	1,470	0.9	430	1.7
Loss $500 or more	1,060	0.5	940	0.6	*	*
Larency, amount undetermined	2,220	1.2	1,850	1.1	340	1.3
Attempted larceny	7,260	3.9	6,160	3.9	1,100	4.3
Auto theft	4,330	2.3	3,360	2.1	980	3.8
Theft of car	3,210	1.7	2,380	1.5	840	3.2
Theft of other vehicle	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted auto theft	1,030	0.5	880	0.5	*	*

Note: The number of households victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A household victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]For "other" races the number of households victimized was too small to be shown separately for each property crime. The number of households was 300; the rate was 23.1 percent.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 35. Number and percent of households victimized by property crimes, by race or ethnic origin of head of household (1970)

Type of property crime	Total[1]		White[2]		Black		Mexican or other Spanish	
	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized
Total	128,190	39.7	113,260	39.9	2,420	44.5	9,890	38.2
Burglary	40,480	12.5	35,100	12.3	900	16.5	3,350	12.9
Forcible entry	14,790	4.5	12,540	4.4	*	*	1,650	6.3
Nothing taken	3,720	1.1	3,330	1.1	*	*	*	*
Loss less than $10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	2,050	0.8	1,650	0.5	*	*	*	*
Loss $50-99	2,010	0.6	1,770	0.6	*	*	*	*
Loss $100-249	2,620	0.8	2,150	0.7	*	*	*	*
Loss $250-499	1,670	0.5	1,390	0.4	*	*	*	*
Loss $500-999	1,310	0.4	930	0.3	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	1,570	0.4	1,410	0.4	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Unlawful entry	20,140	6.2	17,710	6.2	*	*	1,410	5.4
Nothing taken	2,820	0.8	2,480	0.8	*	*	*	*
Loss less than $10	1,850	0.5	1,630	0.5	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	6,390	1.9	5,700	2.0	*	*	*	*
Loss $50-99	4,320	1.3	3,900	1.3	*	*	*	*
Loss $100-249	3,640	1.1	3,120	1.1	*	*	*	*
Loss $250-499	1,840	0.5	1,720	0.6	*	*	*	*
Loss $500-999	590	0.1	520	0.1	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted forcible entry	8,900	2.7	7,840	2.7	*	*	500	1.9
Larceny	102,990	31.9	91,930	32.4	1,720	31.7	7,640	29.5
Petty	68,230	21.1	61,290	21.6	980	17.9	4,800	18.5
Loss less than $5	14,070	4.3	12,630	4.4	*	*	1,070	4.1
Loss $5-9	15,950	4.9	14,460	5.1	*	*	950	3.6
Loss $10-24	27,990	8.6	24,860	8.7	*	*	2,160	8.3
Loss $25-49	24,920	7.7	22,670	8.0	*	*	1,580	6.1
Grand	37,960	11.7	33,530	11.8	800	14.7	2,970	11.4
Loss $50-99	21,490	6.6	19,070	6.7	*	*	1,520	5.8
Loss $100-249	13,910	4.3	12,240	4.3	*	*	1,190	4.6
Loss $250-499	3,650	1.1	3,350	1.1	*	*	*	*
Loss $500 or more	3,190	0.9	2,810	0.9	*	*	*	*
Larceny, amount undetermined	4,420	1.3	3,680	1.3	*	*	560	2.1
Attempted larceny	11,630	3.6	10,530	3.7	*	*	950	3.6
Auto theft	6,360	1.9	5,060	1.3	*	*	800	3.0
Theft of car	3,720	1.1	2,820	0.9	*	*	*	*
Theft of other vehicle	860	0.2	630	0.2	*	*	*	*
Attempted auto theft	1,820	0.5	1,610	0.5	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of households victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A household victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]The total is not the sum of the detail because data for other races were excluded for lack of a significant number of sample cases, and because race or ethnic origin was not ascertained in an estimated three-tenths of 1 percent of the total cases.

[2]Excluding persons or Mexican and other Spanish origin.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 36. Number and percent of households victimized by property crimes, by family income[1] (1970)

Type of property crime	Less than $7,500		$7,500–9,999		More than $10,000	
	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized
Total	20,210	32.2	10,780	37.9	33,390	43.2
Burglary	8,210	13.1	2,790	9.8	9,590	12.4
Forcible entry	4,100	6.5	1,270	4.4	3,470	4.4
Nothing taken	930	1.4	370	1.3	780	1.0
Loss less than $10	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	520	0.8	*	*	600	0.7
Loss $50-99	700	1.1	*	*	360	0.4
Loss $100-249	850	1.3	*	*	480	0.6
Loss $250-499	520	0.8	*	*	620	0.8
Loss $500-999	610	0.9	*	*	430	0.5
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Unlawful entry	3,150	5.0	1,050	3.7	4,800	6.2
Nothing taken	770	1.2	*	*	870	1.1
Loss less than $10	410	0.6	*	*	580	0.7
Loss $10-49	800	1.2	370	1.2	1,470	1.8
Loss $50-99	420	0.6	*	*	1,020	1.3
Loss $100-249	540	0.8	*	*	1,070	1.3
Loss $250-499	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $500-999	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted forcible entry	1,720	2.7	530	1.8	2,100	2.7
Larceny	14,120	22.5	8,980	31.6	26,820	34.7
Petty	9,340	14.9	6,120	21.5	18,330	23.7
Loss less than $5	1,920	3.0	1,240	4.3	4,470	5.7
Loss $5-9	2,100	3.3	1,200	4.2	4,640	6.0
Loss $10-24	3,360	5.3	2,180	7.6	7,050	9.1
Loss $25-49	3,510	5.6	2,430	8.5	5,800	7.5
Grand	5,340	8.5	3,230	11.3	9,400	12.1
Loss $50-99	3,000	4.8	1,570	5.5	5,170	6.7
Loss $100-249	1,720	2.7	1,350	4.7	3,590	4.6
Loss $250-499	680	1.0	520	1.8	630	0.8
Loss $500 or more	420	0.6	*	*	570	0.7
Larceny, amount undetermined	620	0.9	*	*	1,000	1.2
Attempted larceny	1,830	2.9	1,330	4.6	3,470	4.5
Auto theft	1,420	2.2	880	3.0	1,630	2.1
Theft of car	1,070	1.7	630	2.2	1,270	1.6
Theft of other vehicle	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted auto theft	310	0.4	*	*	320	0.4

Note: The number of households victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A household victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]An estimated 7.5 percent of the total cases are excluded from the detail because the family income was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 36. Number and percent of households victimized by property crimes, by family income[1] (1970)

Type of property crime	Less than $7,500		$7,500–9,999		More than $10,000	
	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized
Total	36,170	35.3	17,430	43.6	69,010	43.1
Burglary	13,920	13.6	5,640	14.1	19,420	12.1
Forcible entry	5,680	5.6	1,770	4.4	6,830	4.2
Nothing taken	1,330	1.3	*	*	1,940	1.2
Loss less than $10	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	880	0.8	*	*	940	0.5
Loss $50-99	830	0.8	*	*	920	0.5
Loss $100-249	950	0.9	*	*	1,320	0.8
Loss $250-499	690	0.6	*	*	650	0.4
Loss $500-999	640	0.6	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*	650	0.4
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Unlawful entry	6,790	6.6	3,120	7.8	9,570	5.9
Nothing taken	1,000	0.9	510	1.2	1,100	0.6
Loss less than $10	640	0.6	*	*	910	0.5
Loss $10-49	2,370	2.3	1,000	2.5	2,810	1.7
Loss $50-99	1,760	1.7	*	*	2,200	1.3
Loss $100-249	1,220	1.1	670	1.6	1,550	0.9
Loss $250-499	*	*	*	*	1,170	0.7
Loss $500-999	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted forcible entry	2,730	2.6	1,070	2.6	4,580	2.8
Larceny	27,060	26.4	14,190	35.5	57,100	35.6
Petty	17,880	17.4	8,820	22.0	38,080	23.7
Loss less than $5	3,760	3.6	2,260	5.6	7,440	4.6
Loss $5-9	3,950	3.8	2,910	7.2	8,460	5.2
Loss $10-24	6,800	6.6	2,600	6.5	17,100	10.6
Loss $25-49	7,390	7.2	2,960	7.4	13,550	8.4
Grand	9,660	9.4	5,550	13.9	21,490	13.4
Loss $50-99	5,550	5.4	3,160	7.9	11,980	7.4
Loss $100-249	3,180	3.1	1,890	4.7	8,380	5.2
Loss $250-499	1,300	1.2	*	*	1,870	1.1
Loss $500 or more	920	0.9	500	1.2	1,660	1.0
Larceny, amount undetermined	1,480	1.4	*	*	2,350	1.4
Attempted larceny	3,030	2.9	2,100	5.2	6,240	3.9
Auto theft	2,300	2.2	680	1.7	3,010	1.8
Theft of car	1,450	1.4	*	*	1,600	0.9
Theft of other vehicle	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted auto theft	510	0.4	*	*	980	0.6

Note: The number of households victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A household victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]An estimated 6.3 percent of the total cases are excluded from the detail because the family income was not ascertained.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 37. Number and percent of households victimized by property crimes, by owner-renter status (1970)

Type of property crime	Owners		Renters	
	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized
Total	41,520	36.3	26,380	41.4
Burglary	12,880	11.2	8,890	13.9
Forcible entry	5,010	4.3	4,190	6.5
Nothing taken	1,170	1.0	950	1.4
Loss less than $10	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	740	0.6	530	0.8
Loss $50-99	620	0.5	590	0.9
Loss $100-249	850	0.7	730	1.1
Loss $250-499	570	0.4	690	1.0
Loss $500-999	540	0.4	800	1.2
Loss $1,000 or more	490	0.4	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*
Unlawful entry	5,780	5.0	3,790	5.9
Nothing taken	1,090	0.9	980	1.5
Loss less than $10	750	0.6	520	0.8
Loss $10-49	1,800	1.5	930	1.4
Loss $50-99	960	0.8	640	1.0
Loss $100-249	1,130	0.9	690	1.0
Loss $250-499	*	*	*	*
Loss $500-999	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*
Attempted forcible entry	3,040	2.6	1,630	2.5
Larceny	32,240	28.1	20,380	32.0
Petty	22,270	19.4	13,200	20.7
Loss less than $5	5,680	4.9	2,260	3.5
Loss $5-9	4,760	4.1	3,360	5.2
Loss $10-24	8,350	7.3	4,920	7.7
Loss $25-49	7,190	6.2	5,340	8.3
Grand	10,780	9.4	7,920	12.4
Loss $50-99	6,080	5.3	4,050	6.3
Loss $100-249	3,690	3.2	3,340	5.2
Loss $250-499	1,100	0.9	820	1.2
Loss $500 or more	540	0.4	450	0.7
Larceny, amount undetermined	1,190	1.0	1,030	1.6
Attempted larceny	4,750	4.1	2,450	3.8
Auto theft	2,110	1.8	2,090	3.2
Theft of car	1,560	1.3	1,520	2.3
Theft of other vehicle	*	*	*	*
Attempted auto theft	470	0.4	560	0.8

Note: The number of households victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A household victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 37. Number and percent of households victimized by property crimes, by owner-renter status (1970)

Type of property crime	Owners		Renters	
	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized
Total	75,150	39.1	49,000	41.0
Burglary	20,460	10.6	18,330	15.3
Forcible entry	7,160	3.7	7,080	5.9
Nothing taken	1,980	1.0	1,290	1.0
Loss less than $10	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	1,100	0.5	830	0.6
Loss $50-99	1,010	0.5	1,000	0.8
Loss $100-249	960	0.4	1,670	1.3
Loss $250-499	610	0.3	1,060	0.8
Loss $500-999	770	0.4	540	0.4
Loss $1,000 or more	930	0.4	630	0.5
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*
Unlawful entry	9,620	5.0	9,620	8.0
Nothing taken	1,240	0.6	1,440	1.2
Loss less than $10	890	0.4	930	0.7
Loss $10-49	2,860	1.4	3,020	2.5
Loss $50-99	2,080	1.0	2,100	1.7
Loss $100-249	1,690	0.8	1,810	1.5
Loss $250-499	990	0.5	810	0.6
Loss $500-999	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*
Attempted forcible entry	4,870	2.5	3,660	3.0
Larceny	61,930	32.2	38,270	32.0
Petty	42,240	21.9	24,370	20.4
Loss less than $5	9,430	4.9	4,570	3.8
Loss $5-9	10,080	5.2	5,510	4.6
Loss $10-24	16,870	8.7	10,270	8.6
Loss $25-49	15,340	7.9	9,170	7.6
Grand	22,790	11.8	13,860	11.6
Loss $50-99	13,440	6.9	7,350	6.1
Loss $100-249	8,330	4.3	5,020	4.2
Loss $250-499	1,890	0.9	1,690	1.4
Loss $500 or more	1,400	0.7	1,640	1.3
Larceny, amount undetermined	2,260	1.1	2,000	1.6
Attempted larceny	6,870	3.5	4,610	3.8
Auto theft	3,350	1.7	2,670	2.2
Theft of car	1,850	0.9	1,730	1.4
Theft of other vehicle	*	*	*	*
Attempted auto theft	1,090	0.5	610	0.5

Note: The number of households victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A household victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 38. Number and percent of households victimized by property crimes, by area of residence (1970)

Type of property crime	Total county		Low-income area[1]		Remainder of county	
	Total Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Total Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Total Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized
Total	68,830	37.8	9,470	44.2	59,360	36.9
Burglary	22,250	12.2	4,340	20.2	17,910	11.1
Forcible entry	9,500	5.2	2,630	12.3	6,870	4.2
Nothing taken	2,280	1.2	260	1.2	2,020	1.2
Loss less than $10	420	0.2	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	1,310	0.7	440	2.0	870	0.5
Loss $50-99	1,240	0.6	460	2.1	780	0.4
Loss $100-249	1,650	0.9	690	3.2	960	0.6
Loss $250-499	1,280	0.7	550	2.5	740	0.4
Loss $500-999	1,350	0.7	410	1.9	930	0.5
Loss $1,000 or more	700	0.3	*	*	560	0.3
Loss, amount undetermined	270	0.1	*	*	*	*
Unlawful entry	9,790	5.3	1,140	5.3	8,640	5.3
Nothing taken	2,070	1.1	*	*	1,940	1.2
Loss less than $10	1,270	0.6	*	*	1,120	0.6
Loss $10-49	2,770	1.5	510	2.3	2,260	1.4
Loss $50-99	1,690	0.9	260	1.2	1,440	0.8
Loss $100-249	1,860	1.0	220	1.0	1,650	1.0
Loss $250-499	460	0.2	*	*	460	0.2
Loss $500-999	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	300	0.1	*	*	*	*
Attempted forcible entry	4,710	2.5	1,010	4.7	3,690	2.3
Larceny	53,290	29.2	6,340	29.6	46,950	29.2
Petty	35,860	19.7	4,210	19.6	31,650	19.7
Loss less than $5	8,000	4.3	630	2.9	7,370	4.5
Loss $5-9	8,290	4.5	790	3.8	7,500	4.6
Loss $10-24	13,400	7.3	1,690	7.8	11,710	7.2
Loss $25-49	12,680	6.9	1,800	8.3	10,880	6.7
Grand	19,000	10.4	2,600	12.1	16,400	10.2
Loss $50-99	10,280	5.6	1,500	7.0	8,770	5.4
Loss $100-249	7,110	3.9	920	4.2	6,200	3.8
Loss $250-499	1,920	1.0	290	1.3	1,640	1.0
Loss $500 or more	1,060	0.5	*	*	910	0.5
Larceny, amount undetermined	2,220	1.2	310	1.4	1,910	1.1
Attempted larceny	7,260	3.9	640	3.0	6,620	4.1
Auto theft	4,330	2.3	690	3.2	3,640	2.2
Theft of car	3,210	1.7	550	2.5	2,660	1.6
Theft of other vehicle	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted auto theft	1,030	0.5	*	*	900	0.5

Note: The number of households victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A household victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-income area" in Glossary.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 38. Number and percent of households victimized by property crimes, by area of residence (1970)

Type of property crime	Total county		Low-income area[1]		Remainder of county	
	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized
Total	128,190	39.7	14,670	38.1	113,530	39.9
Burglary	40,480	12.5	5,630	14.6	34,850	12.2
Forcible entry	14,790	4.5	2,620	6.8	12,170	4.2
Nothing taken	3,720	1.1	640	1.6	3,070	1.0
Loss less than $10	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	2,050	0.6	*	*	1,800	0.6
Loss $50-99	2,010	0.6	520	1.3	1,490	0.5
Loss $100-249	2,620	0.8	510	1.3	2,110	0.7
Loss $250-499	1,670	0.5	370	0.9	1,300	0.4
Loss $500-999	1,310	0.4	*	*	1,010	0.3
Loss $1,000 or more	1,570	0.4	*	*	1,450	0.5
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Unlawful entry	20,140	6.2	2,490	6.4	17,660	6.2
Nothing taken	2,820	0.8	*	*	2,550	0.8
Loss less than $10	1,850	0.5	*	*	1,530	0.5
Loss $10-49	6,390	1.9	940	2.4	5,450	1.9
Loss $50-99	4,320	1.3	460	1.1	3,870	1.3
Loss $100-249	3,640	1.1	510	1.3	3,130	1.1
Loss $250-499	1,840	0.5	*	*	1,690	0.5
Loss $500-999	590	0.1	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted forcible entry	8,900	2.7	1,130	2.9	7,760	2.7
Larceny	102,990	31.9	10,670	27.7	92,330	32.4
Petty	68,230	21.1	6,690	17.3	61,540	21.6
Loss less than $5	14,070	4.3	1,620	4.2	12,440	4.3
Loss $5-9	15,950	4.9	1,340	3.4	14,600	5.1
Loss $10-24	27,990	8.6	2,810	7.3	25,180	8.8
Loss $25-49	24,920	7.7	2,370	6.1	22,550	7.9
Grand	37,960	11.7	3,910	10.1	34,050	11.9
Loss $50-99	21,490	6.6	2,360	6.1	19,130	6.7
Loss $100-249	13,910	4.3	1,310	3.3	12,610	4.4
Loss $250-499	3,650	1.1	490	1.2	3,170	1.1
Loss $500 or more	3,190	0.9	*	*	2,960	1.0
Larceny, amount undetermined	4,420	1.3	690	1.7	3,730	1.3
Attempted larceny	11,630	3.6	1,250	3.2	10,380	3.6
Auto theft	6,360	1.9	1,120	2.9	5,240	1.8
Theft of car	3,720	1.1	660	1.7	3,060	1.0
Theft of other vehicle	860	0.2	*	*	740	0.2
Attempted auto theft	1,820	0.5	380	0.9	1,440	0.5

Note: The number of households victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A household victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-income area" in Glossary.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 39. Number and percent of households victimized by property crimes, by area of residence—inside Dayton (1970)

Type of property crime	Total city		Low-income area[1]		Remainder of city	
	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized
Total	34,140	40.8	9,420	44.1	24,720	39.6
Burglary	13,060	15.6	4,320	20.2	8,740	14.0
Forcible entry	6,440	7.7	2,630	12.3	3,810	6.1
Nothing taken	1,380	1.6	260	1.2	1,120	1.8
Loss less than $10	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	900	1.0	440	2.0	460	0.7
Loss $50-99	990	1.1	460	2.1	540	0.8
Loss $100-249	1,250	1.4	690	3.2	560	0.9
Loss $250-499	920	1.0	550	2.5	370	0.5
Loss $500-999	940	1.1	410	1.9	520	0.8
Loss $1,000 or more	370	0.4	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	190	0.2	*	*	*	*
Unlawful entry	5,250	6.2	1,140	5.3	4,110	6.5
Nothing taken	1,040	1.2	*	*	910	1.4
Loss less than $10	640	0.7	*	*	490	0.7
Loss $10-49	1,670	1.9	510	2.4	1,160	1.8
Loss $50-99	910	1.0	260	1.2	660	1.0
Loss $100-249	880	1.0	220	1.0	660	1.0
Loss $250-499	330	0.3	*	*	*	*
Loss $500-999	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted forcible entry	2,590	3.0	990	4.6	1,600	2.5
Larceny	25,110	30.0	6,320	29.6	18,790	30.1
Petty	16,420	19.6	4,190	19.6	12,230	19.6
Loss less than $5	2,990	3.5	630	2.9	2,360	3.7
Loss $5-9	3,640	4.3	790	3.7	2,850	4.5
Loss $10-24	6,100	7.2	1,690	7.9	4,420	7.0
Loss $25-49	7,030	8.4	1,770	8.3	5,260	8.4
Grand	9,250	11.0	2,600	12.1	6,650	10.6
Loss $50-99	4,790	5.7	1,500	7.0	3,290	5.2
Loss $100-249	3,750	4.4	920	4.2	2,830	4.5
Loss $250-499	1,120	1.3	290	1.3	830	1.3
Loss $500 or more	440	0.5	*	*	*	*
Larceny, amount undetermined	1,360	1.6	310	1.4	1,040	1.6
Attempted larceny	3,750	4.4	640	3.0	3,110	4.9
Auto theft	2,160	2.5	690	3.2	1,470	2.3
Theft of car	1,700	2.0	550	2.5	1,140	1.8
Theft of other vehicle	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted auto theft	460	0.5	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of households victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A household victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-income area" in Glossary.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 39. Number and percent of households victimized by property crimes, by area of residence—inside San Jose (1970)

Type of property crime	Total city		Low-income area[1]		Remainder of city	
	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized	Number of households victimized	Percent of total households victimized
Total	52,130	40.3	13,240	38.7	38,890	40.9
Burglary	17,610	13.6	5,220	15.2	12,390	13.0
Forcible entry	6,610	5.1	2,410	7.0	4,200	4.4
Nothing taken	1,730	1.3	570	1.6	1,160	1.2
Loss less than $10	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	870	0.5	*	*	*	*
Loss $50-99	770	0.6	480	1.4	*	*
Loss $100-249	1,310	1.0	510	1.4	800	0.8
Loss $250-499	820	0.6	*	*	*	*
Loss $500-999	760	0.5	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	830	0.6	*	*	710	0.7
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Unlawful entry	9,110	7.0	2,370	6.9	6,740	7.0
Nothing taken	1,030	0.7	*	*	790	0.8
Loss less than $10	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	2,790	2.1	900	2.6	1,880	1.9
Loss $50-99	1,900	1.4	460	1.3	1,450	1.5
Loss $100-249	2,030	1.5	510	1.4	1,530	1.6
Loss $250-499	900	0.6	*	*	740	0.7
Loss $500-999	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted forcible entry	3,420	2.6	1,050	3.0	2,370	2.4
Larceny	41,820	32.3	9,560	27.9	32,260	33.9
Petty	28,060	21.7	6,020	17.6	22,040	23.2
Loss less than $5	5,990	4.6	1,500	4.3	4,490	4.7
Loss $5-9	6,830	5.2	1,290	3.7	5,540	5.8
Loss $10-24	11,790	9.1	2,590	7.5	9,200	9.6
Loss $25-49	9,480	7.3	2,050	6.0	7,430	7.8
Grand	15,740	12.1	3,430	10.0	12,310	12.9
Loss $50-99	8,830	6.8	2,090	6.1	6,740	7.0
Loss $100-249	6,270	4.8	1,180	3.4	5,090	5.3
Loss $250-499	1,600	1.2	370	1.0	1,230	1.2
Loss $500 or more	1,150	0.8	*	*	920	0.9
Larceny, amount undetermined	1,430	1.1	550	1.6	870	0.9
Attempted larceny	5,230	4.0	1,160	3.4	4,070	4.2
Auto theft	3,150	2.4	1,120	3.2	2,030	2.1
Theft of car	1,810	1.4	660	1.9	1,150	1.2
Theft of other vehicle	560	0.4	*	*	*	*
Attempted auto theft	820	0.6	380	1.1	*	*

Note: The number of households victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A household victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-income area" in Glossary.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

Section D. Characteristics of household incidents

DAYTON

Table 40. Property crimes by place of occurrence (1970)

Type of property crime	Total incidents[1]	In or near own home	Street/park/ field	School/store/ office	Elsewhere[2]
Total	113,810	54,500	35,110	12,300	10,980
Burglary	27,440	25,270	X	X	2,110
Forcible entry	10,900	10,010	X	X	880
Nothing taken	2,520	2,270	X	X	*
Loss less than $10	420	420	X	X	*
Loss $10-49	1,310	1,180	X	X	*
Loss $50-99	1,260	1,220	X	X	*
Loss $100-249	1,690	1,580	X	X	*
Loss $250-499	1,340	1,110	X	X	*
Loss $500-999	1,390	1,310	X	X	*
Loss $1,000 or more	700	650	X	X	*
Loss, amount undetermined	270	270	X	X	*
Unlawful entry	11,230	10,290	X	X	920
Nothing taken	2,250	2,230	X	X	*
Loss less than $10	1,310	1,210	X	X	*
Loss $10-49	2,950	2,700	X	X	*
Loss $50-99	1,760	1,600	X	X	*
Loss $100-249	1,930	1,640	X	X	*
Loss $250-499	460	370	X	X	*
Loss $500-999	*	*	X	X	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	X	X	*
Loss, amount undetermined	300	300	X	X	*
Attempted forcible entry	5,310	4,980	X	X	310
Larceny	81,740	28,200	31,820	12,220	8,630
Petty	48,530	17,900	16,210	8,620	5,310
Loss less than $5	9,070	3,540	2,870	1,640	990
Loss $5-9	9,180	3,670	2,690	1,730	1,070
Loss $10-24	15,480	5,110	5,240	3,230	1,680
Loss $25-49	14,790	5,580	5,410	2,020	1,570
Grand	22,330	6,420	10,640	2,670	2,350
Loss $50-99	11,330	3,770	4,890	1,370	1,210
Loss $100-249	7,810	1,700	4,590	730	710
Loss $250-499	2,120	670	820	400	*
Loss $500 or more	1,060	*	330	*	*
Larceny, amount undetermined	2,470	1,190	790	*	340
Attempted larceny	8,420	2,680	4,180	810	630
Auto theft	4,630	1,030	3,290	*	*
Theft of car	3,460	690	2,540	*	*
Theft of other vehicle	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted auto theft	1,030	*	710	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

[1]An estimated eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total cases are excluded from the detail because the place of occurrence was not ascertained.

[2]Includes places such as inside home of friend, relative, or neighbor; vacation home; or other building.

X = Not applicable.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 40. Property crimes by place of occurrence (1970)

Type of property crime	Total incidents[1]	In or near own home	Street/park/ field	School/store/ office	Elsewhere[2]
Total	215,760	97,860	55,870	28,270	32,150
Burglary	49,570	44,570	X	X	4,860
Forcible entry	16,520	14,070	X	X	2,450
Nothing taken	4,200	3,650	X	X	550
Loss less than $10	*	*	X	X	*
Loss $10-49	2,340	1,770	X	X	560
Loss $50-99	2,080	1,820	X	X	*
Loss $100-249	2,620	2,180	X	X	*
Loss $250-499	1,750	1,490	X	X	*
Loss $500-999	1,310	1,150	X	X	*
Loss $1,000 or more	1,570	1,350	X	X	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	X	X	*
Unlawful entry	23,530	21,790	X	X	1,670
Nothing taken	2,890	2,750	X	X	*
Loss less than $10	2,030	2,030	X	X	*
Loss $10-49	6,910	6,220	X	X	630
Loss $50-99	4,680	4,310	X	X	*
Loss $100-249	3,760	3,420	X	X	*
Loss $250-499	1,840	1,650	X	X	*
Loss $500-999	630	630	X	X	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	X	X	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	X	X	*
Attempted forcible entry	9,510	8,710	X	X	730
Larceny	159,570	51,250	51,760	28,090	27,000
Petty	95,530	30,800	27,630	21,540	14,650
Loss less than $5	16,230	5,840	4,570	3,830	1,850
Loss $5-9	17,900	6,060	4,720	4,640	2,260
Loss $10-24	31,950	10,490	8,510	7,490	5,080
Loss $25-49	29,460	8,410	9,830	5,580	5,450
Grand	46,710	14,420	17,640	4,800	9,410
Loss $50-99	24,140	7,730	8,630	2,390	5,240
Loss $100-249	15,350	4,690	6,290	1,610	2,470
Loss $250-499	3,960	1,100	1,410	*	1,120
Loss $500 or more	3,260	910	1,300	*	580
Larceny, amount undetermined	4,580	1,590	1,370	760	830
Attempted larceny	12,740	4,430	5,120	990	2,120
Auto theft	6,620	2,040	4,110	*	*
Theft of car	3,870	800	2,750	*	*
Theft of other vehicle	860	*	*	*	*
Attempted auto theft	1,890	770	1,130	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

X = Not applicable.

[1]An estimated seven-tenths of 1 percent of the total cases are excluded from the detail because the place of occurrence was not ascertained.

[2]Includes places such as inside home of friend, relative, or neighbor; vacation home; or other building.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 41. Property crimes by time of occurrence (1970)

Type of property crime	Total incidents	Day (6 a.m.–6 p.m.)	Evening and night			Don't know or undetermined
			Total	6 p.m.–midnight	Midnight–6 a.m.	
Total	113,810	35,720	61,620	33,180	28,440	16,470
Burglary	27,440	8,030	14,230	7,720	6,510	5,170
Forcible entry	10,900	3,540	5,510	2,810	2,700	1,850
Nothing taken	2,520	460	1,650	780	870	410
Loss less than $10	420	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	1,310	*	760	*	610	*
Loss $50-99	1,260	470	590	340	*	*
Loss $100-249	1,690	620	650	410	*	410
Loss $250-499	1,340	620	580	320	*	*
Loss $500-999	1,390	670	490	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	700	*	540	500	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	270	*	*	*	*	*
Unlawful entry	11,230	3,370	5,490	3,500	1,990	2,360
Nothing taken	2,250	370	1,650	900	750	*
Loss less than $10	1,310	*	560	420	*	450
Loss $10-49	2,950	1,000	1,170	900	470	570
Loss $50-99	1,760	450	830	660	*	480
Loss $100-249	1,930	940	610	360	*	380
Loss $250-499	460	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $500-999	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	300	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted forcible entry	5,310	1,120	3,230	1,410	1,820	960
Larceny	81,740	26,600	44,180	23,890	20,290	10,960
Petty	48,530	16,390	25,170	14,310	10,860	6,960
Loss less than $5	9,070	3,020	4,850	2,820	2,030	1,190
Loss $5-9	9,180	2,970	4,770	2,610	2,160	1,430
Loss $10-24	15,480	5,650	7,490	4,630	2,860	2,360
Loss $25-49	14,790	4,750	8,060	4,250	3,810	1,980
Grand	22,330	7,690	11,990	6,150	5,840	2,650
Loss $50-99	11,330	4,140	5,850	3,110	2,740	1,340
Loss $100-249	7,810	2,360	4,630	2,240	2,390	820
Loss $250-499	2,120	880	960	580	380	*
Loss $500 or more	1,060	320	530	*	320	*
Larceny, amount undetermined	2,470	830	750	680	370	590
Attempted larceny	8,420	1,680	5,980	2,760	3,220	750
Auto theft	4,630	1,100	3,210	1,570	1,640	330
Theft of car	3,460	860	2,440	1,150	1,290	*
Theft of other vehicle	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted auto theft	1,030	*	630	320	310	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 41. Property crimes by time of occurrence (1970)

Type of property crime	Total incidents	Day (6 a.m.–6 p.m.)	Evening and night			Don't know or undetermined
			Total	6 p.m.–midnight	Midnight–6 a.m.	
Total	215,760	83,410	93,260	57,540	35,720	39,100
Burglary	49,570	16,100	20,420	12,070	8,350	13,060
Forcible entry	16,520	5,830	6,580	3,980	2,600	4,110
Nothing taken	4,200	1,530	1,680	900	780	990
Loss less than $10	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	2,340	640	620	*	*	1,070
Loss $50-99	2,080	570	880	580	*	630
Loss $100-249	2,620	870	1,160	610	550	590
Loss $250-499	1,750	730	670	610	*	*
Loss $500-999	1,310	620	680	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	1,570	570	650	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Unlawful entry	23,530	7,800	9,670	5,970	3,700	6,060
Nothing taken	2,890	700	1,510	920	590	680
Loss less than $10	2,030	810	850	*	*	370
Loss $10-49	6,910	2,110	2,770	1,800	970	2,030
Loss $50-99	4,680	1,700	1,900	1,350	550	1,070
Loss $100-249	3,760	1,400	1,310	840	*	1,040
Loss $250-499	1,840	580	810	*	520	*
Loss $500-999	630	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted forcible entry	9,510	2,470	4,150	2,110	2,040	2,890
Larceny	159,570	65,940	67,980	42,920	25,060	25,640
Petty	95,530	42,590	37,570	24,690	12,880	15,380
Loss less than $5	16,230	6,370	6,900	4,080	2,820	2,960
Loss $5-9	17,900	8,660	6,290	4,530	1,760	2,940
Loss $10-24	31,950	15,000	12,140	7,780	4,360	4,800
Loss $25-49	29,460	12,550	12,240	8,300	3,940	4,670
Grand	46,710	17,970	21,670	12,960	8,710	7,070
Loss $50-99	24,140	10,820	9,340	5,870	3,470	3,980
Loss $100-249	15,350	4,880	8,320	4,690	3,630	2,140
Loss $250-499	3,960	1,390	2,170	1,240	930	*
Loss $500 or more	3,260	870	1,740	1,150	690	550
Larceny, amount undetermined	4,580	1,370	1,820	1,420	*	1,390
Attempted larceny	12,740	4,020	69,300	3,860	3,070	1,800
Auto theft	6,620	1,370	48,600	2,550	2,310	*
Theft of car	3,870	850	29,100	1,750	1,160	*
Theft of other vehicle	860	*	4,600	*	*	*
Attempted auto theft	1,890	*	14,900	600	890	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 42. Person reporting offense to police by type of property crime (1970)

Type of property crime	Total incidents	Total reported to police	Reported by		Not reported to police	Reporting status not determined
			Victim	Someone else		
Total	113,810	47,060	39,510	7,540	66,030	720
Burglary	27,440	15,630	13,460	2,170	11,640	*
Forcible entry	10,900	8,340	7,200	1,140	2,470	*
Nothing taken	2,520	1,610	1,230	380	870	*
Loss less than $10	420	310	310	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	1,310	770	690	*	540	*
Loss $50-99	1,260	850	740	*	410	*
Loss $100-249	1,690	1,400	1,300	*	*	*
Loss $250-499	1,340	1,250	980	*	*	*
Loss $500-999	1,390	1,230	1,150	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	700	660	590	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	270	*	*	*	*	*
Unlawful entry	11,230	5,100	4,400	700	6,040	*
Nothing taken	2,250	890	730	*	1,320	*
Loss less than $10	1,310	*	*	*	1,070	*
Loss $10-49	2,950	990	880	*	1,970	*
Loss $50-99	1,760	950	770	*	810	*
Loss $100-249	1,930	1,400	1,230	*	480	*
Loss $250-499	460	290	290	*	*	*
Loss $500-999	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	300	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted forcible entry	5,310	2,190	1,860	340	3,120	*
Larceny	81,740	27,970	22,940	5,030	53,210	560
Petty	48,530	12,100	9,870	2,240	36,220	*
Loss less than $5	9,070	920	750	*	8,110	*
Loss $5-9	9,180	1,240	920	320	7,910	*
Loss $10-24	15,480	3,390	2,910	480	12,050	*
Loss $25-49	14,790	6,550	5,280	1,270	8,150	*
Grand	22,330	13,620	11,600	2,020	8,550	*
Loss $50-99	11,330	6,040	4,700	1,340	5,290	*
Loss $100-249	7,810	5,280	4,880	400	2,450	*
Loss $250-499	2,120	1,440	1,280	1,160	600	*
Loss $500 or more	1,060	850	740	*	*	*
Larceny, amount undetermined	2,470	510	380	*	1,930	*
Attempted larceny	8,420	1,750	1,090	650	6,510	*
Auto theft	4,630	3,460	3,110	340	1,170	*
Theft of car	3,460	3,020	2,710	310	440	*
Theft of other vehicle	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted auto theft	1,030	300	*	*	730	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 42. Person reporting offense to police by type of property crime (1970)

Type of property crime	Total incidents	Total reported to police	Reported by		Not reported to police	Reporting status not determined
			Victim	Someone else		
Total	215,760	85,510	66,650	18,860	128,580	1,670
Burglary	49,570	26,600	20,950	5,650	22,530	*
Forcible entry	16,520	11,640	9,100	2,540	4,770	*
Nothing taken	4,200	2,470	1,420	1,050	1,720	*
Loss less than $10	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-49	2,340	1,480	1,130	*	810	*
Loss $50-99	2,080	1,390	1,080	*	520	*
Loss $100-249	2,620	1,840	1,700	*	780	*
Loss $250-499	1,750	1,380	1,140	*	*	*
Loss $500-999	1,310	1,310	950	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	1,570	1,420	1,360	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Unlawful entry	23,530	11,610	9,490	2,120	11,770	*
Nothing taken	2,890	1,250	770	*	1,640	*
Loss less than $10	2,030	*	*	*	1,630	*
Loss $10-49	6,910	2,000	1,660	*	4,910	*
Loss $50-99	4,680	2,880	2,440	*	1,800	*
Loss $100-249	3,760	2,660	2,330	*	1,020	*
Loss $250-499	1,840	1,550	1,220	*	*	*
Loss $500-999	630	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $1,000 or more	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss, amount undetermined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted forcible entry	9,510	3,360	2,360	990	5,970	*
Larceny	159,570	54,280	41,600	12,680	104,290	1,000
Petty	95,530	21,110	15,720	5,390	73,900	520
Loss less than $5	16,230	1,920	1,230	530	14,160	*
Loss $5-9	17,900	2,480	1,680	810	15,340	*
Loss $10-24	31,950	5,760	4,130	1,630	26,040	*
Loss $25-49	29,460	11,090	8,680	2,410	18,220	*
Grand	46,710	29,420	22,940	6,480	17,000	*
Loss $50-99	24,140	14,020	10,610	3,410	9,870	*
Loss $100-249	15,350	10,040	7,760	2,280	5,270	*
Loss $250-499	3,960	2,560	2,130	*	1,400	*
Loss $500 or more	3,260	2,800	2,440	*	*	*
Larceny, amount undetermined	4,580	1,220	1,140	*	3,220	*
Attempted larceny	12,740	2,530	1,800	720	10,170	*
Auto theft	6,620	4,620	4,100	520	1,780	*
Theft of car	3,870	3,390	3,090	*	*	*
Theft of other vehicle	860	750	750	*	*	*
Attempted auto theft	1,890	*	*	*	1,370	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 43. Larceny and burglary by amount of loss and percent recovered (1970)

Amount of loss and percent recovered	Total incidents	Larceny	Burglary		
			Total	Forcible entry	Unlawful entry
Total	90,950	73,320	17,630	8,450	9,180
Loss less than $10	19,890	18,260	1,640	370	1,260
None recovered	18,600	17,070	1,530	370	1,160
0-49% recovered	*	*	*	*	*
50-99% recovered	*	*	*	*	*
All recovered	1,020	920	*	*	*
Amount recovered not determined	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-249	60,360	49,420	10,940	4,260	6,680
None recovered	43,300	35,360	7,940	3,100	4,840
0-49% recovered	1,620	1,230	390	*	*
50-99% recovered	3,850	3,010	840	340	500
All recovered	11,070	9,420	1,650	550	1,100
Amount recovered not determined	520	400	*	*	*
Loss $250 or more	7,340	3,180	4,150	3,420	730
None recovered	4,390	1,990	2,400	2,030	370
0-49% recovered	380	*	*	*	*
50-99% recovered	990	*	700	580	*
All recovered	1,450	670	780	590	*
Amount recovered not determined	*	*	*	*	*
Amount of loss not determined	3,360	2,470	900	390	500

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 43. Larceny and burglary by amount of loss and percent recovered (1970)

Amount of loss and percent recovered	Total incidents	Larceny	Burglary		
			Total	Forcible entry	Unlawful entry
Total	179,790	146,830	32,970	12,330	20,640
Loss less than $10	36,200	33,810	2,390	*	2,030
None recovered	32,840	30,600	2,240	*	1,880
0-49% recovered	*	*	*	*	*
50-99% recovered	*	*	*	*	*
All recovered	1,980	1,830	*	*	*
Amount recovered not determined	590	590	*	*	*
Loss $10-249	123,280	100,890	22,390	7,040	15,350
None recovered	93,050	75,570	17,480	5,790	11,690
0-49% recovered	5,390	4,290	1,100	*	660
50-99% recovered	6,120	4,940	1,180	*	1,020
All recovered	17,320	14,730	2,600	640	1,950
Amount recovered not determined	1,400	1,370	*	*	*
Loss $250 or more	14,640	7,230	7,410	4,620	2,790
None recovered	8,130	3,700	4,430	2,790	1,640
0-49% recovered	950	*	550	550	*
50-99% recovered	2,810	1,380	1,430	890	540
All recovered	2,280	1,570	710	*	*
Amount recovered not determined	*	*	*	*	*
Amount of loss not determined	5,670	4,900	770	300	470

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 44. Forcible entry by cost of damage and who paid for repairs (1970)

Cost of damage and who paid for repairs	Total incidents	Forcible entry	Attempted forcible entry
Total	16,210	10,900	5,310
Damage less than $10	1,920	1,130	780
Paid by victim	1,590	990	610
Paid by landlord	*	*	*
Paid by insurance	*	*	*
Other	*	*	*
Paid by combination	*	*	*
Damage $10-249	3,120	2,650	470
Paid by victim	1,540	1,240	310
Paid by landlord	*	*	*
Paid by insurance	1,080	1,000	*
Other	*	*	*
Paid by combination	*	*	*
Who paid not determined	*	*	*
Damage $250 and over	*	*	*
Paid by victim	*	*	*
Paid by landlord	*	*	*
Paid by insurance	*	*	*
Other	*	*	*
Paid by combination	*	*	*
Don't know amount	5,170	4,030	1,140
Paid by victim	1,110	780	330
Paid by landlord	2,380	1,960	420
Paid by insurance	350	*	*
Other	960	750	*
Paid by combination	*	*	*
Who paid not determined	300	*	*
No damage	5,800	2,890	2,910

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 44. Forcible entry by cost of damage and who paid for repairs (1970)

Cost of damage and who paid for repairs	Total incidents	Forcible entry	Attempted forcible entry
Total	26,040	16,520	9,510
Damage less than $10	2,280	1,760	520
Paid by victim	1,990	1,520	*
Paid by landlord	*	*	*
Paid by insurance	*	*	*
Other	*	*	*
Paid by combination	*	*	*
Damage $10-249	5,390	3,220	2,170
Paid by victim	2,990	1,750	1,240
Paid by landlord	*	*	*
Paid by insurance	1,420	920	500
Other	*	*	*
Paid by combination	*	*	*
Who paid not determined	*	*	*
Damage $250 and over	*	*	*
Paid by victim	*	*	*
Paid by landlord	*	*	*
Paid by insurance	*	*	*
Other	*	*	*
Paid by combination	*	*	*
Don't know amount	4,970	3,280	1,700
Paid by victim	1,070	930	*
Paid by landlord	1,730	1,180	550
Paid by insurance	*	*	*
Other	1,150	580	580
Paid by combination	*	*	*
Who paid not determined	800	510	*
No damage	12,960	7,820	5,130

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 45. Number of households by number of property victimizations (1970)

Type of property crime	Total incidents	Once	Twice	Three or more times
Total	6,883	4,315	1,506	1,062
Burglary only	1,314	1,131	*	*
Larceny only	4,334	3,005	869	460
Auto theft only	*	*	*	*
Mixed	1,048	*	470	579

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 45. Number of households by number of property victimizations (1970)

Type of property crime	Total incidents	Once	Twice	Three or more times
Total	12,819	7,681	3,099	2,039
Burglary only	2,190	1,921	*	*
Larceny only	8,272	5,510	1,878	884
Auto theft only	*	*	*	*
Mixed	2,095	*	984	1,112

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

Section E. Characteristics of commercial crimes

DAYTON

Table 46. Number of incidents of commercial crime by major type of business (1970)

Type of business	Total incidents	Burglary	Robbery
All businesses	7,290	6,852	438
Retail and wholesale	2,886	2,613	274
Manufacturing	*	*	*
Real estate	767	767	*
Service	3,089	2,943	*
Other	402	384	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 46. Number of incidents of commercial crime by major type of business (1970)

Type of business	Total incidents	Burglary	Robbery
All businesses	8,737	8,037	700
Retail and wholesale	5,130	4,518	613
Manufacturing	210	210	*
Real estate	630	578	*
Service	2,084	2,049	*
Other	683	683	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 47. Number of incidents of commercial crime by employment size (1970)

Employment size	Total incidents	Burglary	Robbery
All businesses	7,290	6,852	438
No paid employees	494	476	*
1 to 3 paid employees	3,051	2,850	201
4 to 7 paid employees	1,571	1,516	*
8 to 19 paid employees	786	731	*
20 or more paid employees	1,389	1,279	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 47. Number of incidents of commercial crime by employment size (1970)

Employment size	Total incidents	Burglary	Robbery
All businesses	8,737	8,037	700
No paid employees	1,331	1,208	*
1 to 3 paid employees	3,344	3,169	*
4 to 7 paid employees	1,874	1,751	*
8 to 19 paid employees	1,016	788	228
20 or more paid employees	1,173	1,121	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 48. Number of incidents of commercial crime[1] by amount of annual receipts (1970)

Amount of annual receipts	Total incidents	Burglary
All businesses	7,290	6,852
$1,000,000 or more	548	512
$500,000 to $999,999	658	603
$100,000 to $499,999	1,261	1,188
$50,000 to $99,999	1,900	1,717
$25,000 to $49,999	1,425	1,389
$10,000 to $24,999	804	786
Less than $10,000	476	458
Not available	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

[1]The number of incidents of robbery was too small to be shown separately for each category of annual receipts. The robbery incidents totaled 438.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 48. Number of incidents of commercial crime by amount of annual receipts (1970)

Amount of annual receipts	Total incidents	Burglary	Robbery
All businesses	8,737	8,037	700
$1,000,000 or more	946	928	*
$500,000 to $999,999	753	735	*
$100,000 to $499,999	1,909	1,663	245
$50,000 to $99,999	1,366	1,226	*
$25,000 to $49,999	1,436	1,401	*
$10,000 to $24,999	1,191	1,051	*
Less than $10,000	1,051	946	*
Not available	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 49. Number of incidents of commercial crime by location of business (1970)

Location of business	Total incidents	Burglary	Robbery
All businesses	7,290	6,852	438
Total inside city	3,253	2,997	255
Low-income area[1]	1,534	1,425	*
Remainder of area	1,718	1,572	*
Total in remainder of county	4,038	3,855	*
Low-income area[1]	*	*	*
Remainder of area	4,038	3,855	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-income area" in Glossary.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 49. Number of incidents of commercial crime by location of business (1970)

Location of business	Total incidents	Burglary	Robbery
All businesses	8,737	8,037	700
Total inside city	3,520	3,204	315
Low-income area[1]	2,959	2,679	280
Remainder of area	560	525	*
Total in remainder of county	5,218	4,833	385
Low-income area[1]	*	*	*
Remainder of area	5,078	4,693	385

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-income area" in Glossary.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 50. Number of incidents of commercial crime by time of occurrence (1970)

Time of occurrence	Total incidents	Burglary	Robbery
Total	7,290	6,852	438
6 a.m.–6 p.m.	530	347	*
6 p.m.–midnight	1,260	1,005	255
Midnight–6 a.m.	2,888	2,888	*
Don't know	2,613	2,613	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 50. Number of incidents of commercial crime by time of occurrence (1970)

Time of occurrence	Total incidents	Burglary	Robbery
Total	8,737	8,037	700
6 a.m.–6 p.m.	963	805	*
6 p.m.–midnight	1,874	1,506	368
Midnight–6 a.m.	3,047	2,889	*
Don't know	2,854	2,837	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 51. Number of incidents of commercial crime by insurance coverage and by police reporting status (1970)

Type of crime	Total incidents	Businesses with insurance		Businesses without insurance		
		Total incidents[1]	Reported to police	Total incidents	Reported to police	Not reported to police
Total	7,290	1,425	1,352	5,866	4,897	969
Burglary	6,852	1,334	1,279	5,519	4,568	951
Entry without theft	1,608	*	*	1,535	1,352	*
Property damage	1,078	*	*	1,005	914	*
No damage	*	*	*	*	*	*
Damage not determined	402	*	*	402	365	*
Entry with theft	3,290	1,060	1,060	2,230	1,918	312
Loss less than $10	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss $10-50	585	*	*	420	347	*
Loss $51-250	1,042	238	238	805	658	*
Loss more than $250	1,389	639	639	749	694	*
Amount of loss not determined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted entry	1,736	201	*	1,534	1,096	438
Entry not determined	219	*	*	219	201	*
Robbery	438	*	*	347	329	*
With weapon	329	*	*	255	237	*
Loss	238	*	*	*	*	*
No loss	*	*	*	*	*	*
Without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss	*	*	*	*	*	*
No loss	*	*	*	*	*	*
Use of weapon not determined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss	*	*	*	*	*	*
No loss	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

[1]The number of incidents of business crime in which the respondent indicated that the incident was not reported to the police was too small to be reliable.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 51. Number of incidents of commercial crime by insurance coverage and by police reporting status (1970)

Type of crime	Total incidents	Businesses with insurance		Businesses without insurance		
		Total incidents[1]	Reported to police	Total incidents	Reported to police	Not reported to police
Total	8,737	1,874	1,821	6,864	4,798	2,066
Burglary	8,037	1,646	1,593	6,391	4,360	2,031
Entry without theft	946	*	*	823	683	*
Property damage	578	*	*	456	333	*
No damage	228	*	*	228	210	*
Damage not determined	140	*	*	*	*	*
Entry with theft	4,868	1,313	1,278	3,555	2,697	858
Loss less than $10	228	*	*	211	*	*
Loss $10-50	788	*	*	630	385	245
Loss $51-250	1,506	280	280	1,226	946	280
Loss more than $250	2,119	788	788	1,331	1,226	*
Amount of loss not determined	228	*	*	*	*	*
Attempted entry	2,136	211	193	1,926	928	998
Entry not determined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Robbery	700	228	228	473	438	*
With weapon	613	228	228	386	368	*
Loss	543	228	228	315	315	*
No loss	*	*	*	*	*	*
Without weapon	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss	*	*	*	*	*	*
No loss	*	*	*	*	*	*
Use of weapon not determined	*	*	*	*	*	*
Loss	*	*	*	*	*	*
No loss	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

[1]The number of incidents of business crime in which the respondent indicated that the incident was not reported to the police was too small to be reliable.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 52. Number of incidents of commercial crime[1] by amount of loss (including property damage costs) and percent recovered from insurance (1970)

Amount of loss and percent recovered	Total incidents	Burglary
Total	7,290	6,852
Loss less than $10	1,206	1,206
None recovered	731	731
0.1-49.9% recovered	*	*
50-99.9% recovered	*	*
All recovered	*	*
Amount recovered not determined	457	457
Loss $10-250	3,454	3,271
None recovered	1,480	1,425
0.1-49.9% recovered	*	*
50-99.9% recovered	347	347
All recovered	*	*
Amount recovered not determined	1,317	1,225
Loss more than $250	1,881	1,809
None recovered	566	566
0.1-49.9% recovered	*	*
50-99.9% recovered	292	274
All recovered	274	256
Amount recovered not determined	584	566
No loss	512	402
Amount of loss not determined	238	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

[1]The number of incidents of robbery was too small to be shown separately for each category of loss. The robbery incidents totaled 438.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 52. Number of incidents of commercial crime by amount of loss (including property damage costs) and percent recovered from insurance (1970)

Amount of loss and percent recovered	Total incidents	Burglary	Robbery
Total	8,737	8,037	700
Loss less than $10	1,051	1,051	*
None recovered	595	595	*
0.1-49.9% recovered	*	*	*
50-99.9% recovered	*	*	*
All recovered	*	*	*
Amount recovered not determined	403	403	*
Loss $10-250	4,220	3,747	473
None recovered	2,101	1,839	263
0.1-49.9% recovered	*	*	*
50-99.9% recovered	280	263	*
All recovered	298	210	*
Amount recovered not determined	1,383	1,331	*
Loss more than $250	2,609	2,486	*
None recovered	648	595	*
0.1-49.9% recovered	245	245	*
50-99.9% recovered	508	490	*
All recovered	245	193	*
Amount recovered not determined	963	963	*
No loss	578	490	*
Amount of loss not determined	280	263	18

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 53. Number of incidents of commercial crime by number of offenders and whether offenders were apprehended (1970)

Type of crime and number of offenders	Total incidents	One or more apprehended[1]	None apprehended	Don't know or not determined
Total	7,290	804	5,427	1,059
Robbery	438	*	292	*
One offender	*	*	*	*
Two or more offenders	274	*	201	*
Burglary	6,852	731	5,135	986

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

[1]Knowledge of the offender's apprehension was obtained from the victim. (See Appendix II, Illustration 7, item 11.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 53. Number of incidents of commercial crime by number of offenders and whether offenders were apprehended (1970)

Type of crime and number of offenders	Total incidents	One or more apprehended[1]	None apprehended	Don't know or not determined
Total	8,737	911	5,778	2,049
Robbery	700	193	385	*
One offender	350	*	*	*
Two or more offenders	333	*	*	*
Number unknown	*	*	*	*
Burglary	8,037	718	5,393	1,926

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

[1]Knowledge of the offender's apprehension was obtained from the victim. (See Appendix II, Illustration 7, item 11.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON and SAN JOSE

Table 54. Number of incidents of robbery of businesses in which financial loss[1] occurred, by type of weapon used (1970)

Type of weapon	Dayton		San Jose	
	Total incidents	With loss	Total incidents	With loss
Robbery	438	329	700	613
With weapon	329	238	613	543
Gun	311	238	490	473
Other weapon	*	*	*	*
Without weapon or use of weapon undetermined	*	*	*	*

Note: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

[1]The number of robberies without loss was too small to be reliable.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 55. Number and percent of businesses with incidents of commercial crime by type of crime (1970)

Type of crime	Number of businesses victimized	Percent of businesses victimized
Total	4,130	21.89
Burglary	3,893	20.63
Entry with theft	2,303	12.21
Value less than $10	*	*
$10 to $50	457	2.42
$51 to $250	823	4.36
More than $250	1,096	5.81
Value not determined	*	*
Entry without theft	968	5.13
With property damage	548	2.91
Without property damage	*	*
Damage not determined	329	1.74
Attempted entry	1,315	6.97
Entry not determined	*	*
Robbery	402	2.13
With loss	292	1.55
With weapon	219	1.16
Without weapon	*	*
Use of weapon not determined	*	*
Without loss	*	*
With weapon	*	*
Without weapon	*	*

Note: The number of businesses victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A business victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 55. Number and percent of businesses with incidents of commercial crime by type of crime (1970)

Type of crime	Number of businesses victimized	Percent of businesses victimized
Total	4,780	19.39
Burglary	4,500	18.25
Entry with theft	2,889	11.72
Value less than $10	*	*
$10 to $50	543	2.20
$51 to $250	1,173	4.76
More than $250	1,558	6.32
Value not determined	*	*
Entry without theft	718	2.91
With property damage	403	1.63
Without property damage	210	0.85
Attempted entry	1,593	6.46
Damage not determined	*	*
Robbery	525	2.13
With loss	438	1.78
With weapon	368	1.49
Without weapon	*	*
Use of weapon not determined	*	*
Without loss	*	*
With weapon	*	*
Without weapon	*	*
Use of weapon not determined	*	*

Note: The number of businesses victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A business victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 56. Number and percent of businesses with incidents of commercial crime by major type of business (1970)

Type of business	Total businesses	Number of businesses victimized			Percent of businesses victimized		
		Total	Burglary	Robbery	Total	Burglary	Robbery
All businesses	18,865	4,130	3,893	402	21.89	20.63	2.13
Retail and wholesale	6,526	1,680	1,516	237	25.75	23.24	3.63
Manufacturing	659	*	*	*	*	*	*
Real estate	2,340	457	457	*	19.52	19.52	*
Service	7,578	1,609	1,536	*	21.23	20.27	*
Other	1,762	274	274	*	15.55	15.55	*

Note: The number of businesses victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A business victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 56. Number and percent of businesses with incidents of commercial crime by major type of business (1970)

Type of business	Total businesses	Number of businesses victimized			Percent of businesses victimized		
		Total	Burglary	Robbery	Total	Burglary	Robbery
All businesses	24,655	4,780	4,500	525	19.39	18.25	2.13
Retail and wholesale	8,155	2,627	2,381	473	32.21	29.20	5.80
Manufacturing	1,228	*	*	*	*	*	*
Real estate	4,075	420	420	*	10.31	10.31	*
Service	8,711	1,191	1,156	*	13.67	13.27	*
Other	2,486	368	368	*	14.79	14.79	*

Note: The number of businesses victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A business victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 57. Number and percent of businesses with incidents of commercial crime[1] by employment size (1970)

Employment size	Total businesses	Number of businesses victimized		Percent of businesses victimized	
		Total	Burglary	Total	Burglary
All businesses	18,865	4,130	3,893	21.89	20.63
No paid employees	3,692	348	330	9.42	8.94
1 to 3 paid employees	7,077	1,736	1,626	24.53	22.98
4 to 7 paid employees	3,564	932	877	26.15	24.61
8 to 19 paid employees	2,285	530	493	23.19	21.59
20 or more paid employees	2,247	585	566	26.02	25.20

Note: The number of businesses victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A business victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]The number of businesses robbed was too small to be shown separately for each category of employment size. The total number of businesses robbed was 402; the percent was 2.13.

SAN JOSE

Table 57. Number and percent of businesses with incidents of commercial crime[1] by employment size (1970)

Employment size	Total businesses	Number of businesses victimized		Percent of businesses victimized	
		Total	Burglary	Total	Burglary
All businesses	24,655	4,780	4,500	19.39	18.25
No paid employees	7,372	753	683	10.21	9.26
1 to 3 paid employees	9,303	1,926	1,891	20.70	20.33
4 to 7 paid employees	3,914	946	876	24.16	22.37
8 to 19 paid employees	2,402	648	560	26.97	23.33
20 or more paid employees	1,663	508	490	30.53	29.47

Note: The number of businesses victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A business victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]The number of businesses robbed was too small to be shown separately for each category of employment size. The total number of businesses robbed was 525; the percent was 2.13.

DAYTON

Table 58. Number and percent of businesses with incidents of commercial crime[1] by amount of annual receipts (1970)

Amount of annual receipts	Total businesses	Number of businesses victimized		Percent of businesses victimized	
		Total	Burglary	Total	Burglary
All businesses	18,865	4,130	3,893	21.89	20.63
$1,000,000 or more	1,644	347	347	21.11	21.11
$500,000 to $999,999	1,279	384	365	30.00	28.57
$100,000 to $499,999	3,235	749	694	23.16	21.46
$50,000 to $99,999	3,544	895	804	25.26	22.68
$25,000 to $49,999	3,146	859	822	27.30	26.14
$10,000 to $24,999	2,637	475	457	18.01	17.32
Less than $10,000	2,850	311	293	10.92	10.30
Amount not determined	530	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of businesses victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A business victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]The number of businesses robbed was too small to be shown in each category of annual receipts. The total number of businesses robbed was 402; the percent was 2.13.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 58. Number and percent of businesses with incidents of commercial crime by amount of annual receipts (1970)

Amount of annual receipts	Total businesses	Number of businesses victimized			Percent of businesses victimized		
		Total	Burglary	Robbery	Total	Burglary	Robbery
All businesses	24,655	4,780	4,500	525	19.39	18.25	2.13
$1,000,000 or more	1,313	368	368	*	28.00	28.00	*
$500,000 to $999,999	893	315	298	*	35.29	33.33	*
$100,000 to $499,999	4,101	1,138	1,016	228	27.76	24.77	5.55
$50,000 to $99,999	3,467	805	788	*	23.23	22.73	*
$25,000 to $49,999	3,117	718	718	*	23.03	23.03	*
$10,000 to $24,999	5,089	700	648	*	13.76	12.73	*
Less than $10,000	6,413	683	613	*	10.65	9.56	*
Amount not determined	263	*	*	*	*	*	*

Note: The number of businesses victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A business victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

DAYTON

Table 59. Number and percent of businesses with incidents of commercial crime by location of business (1970)

Location of business	Total businesses	Number of businesses victimized			Percent of businesses victimized		
		Total	Burglary	Robbery	Total	Burglary	Robbery
All businesses	18,865	4,130	3,893	402	21.89	20.63	2.13
Total inside city	7,100	1,919	1,773	237	27.03	24.98	3.34
Low-income area[1]	3,342	840	786	*	25.14	23.51	*
Remainder of area	3,758	1,079	988	*	28.71	26.28	*
Total in remainder of county	11,765	2,211	2,119	*	18.79	18.01	*
Low-income area[1]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Remainder of area	11,765	2,211	2,119	*	18.79	18.01	*

Note: The number of businesses victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A business victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-come area" in Glossary.)

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

SAN JOSE

Table 59. Number and percent of businesses with incidents of commercial crime by location of business (1970)

Location of business	Total businesses	Number of businesses victimized			Percent of businesses victimized		
		Total	Burglary	Robbery	Total	Burglary	Robbery
All businesses	24,655	4,780	4,500	525	19.39	18.25	2.13
Total inside city	8,629	1,856	1,733	*	21.51	20.09	*
Low-income area[1]	5,953	1,471	1,366	*	24.71	22.94	*
Remainder of area	2,676	385	368	*	14.39	13.74	*
Total in remainder of county	16,026	2,924	2,767	350	18.25	17.26	2.19
Low-income area[1]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Remainder of area	15,903	2,872	2,714	350	18.06	17.07	2.20

Note: The number of businesses victimized is tabulated separately for each category of crime shown. A business victimized more than once is counted once in each applicable category, once in each applicable subtotal, and once in the total. Consequently, the numbers and percentages shown do not add to the total.

*See table and explanation of statistically reliable numbers in introduction to Appendix III.

[1]Census tracts with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes comprise this area. (See definition of "low-income area" in Glossary.)

GLOSSARY

Adult: a person 16 years old or older.

Aggravated assault: an unlawful attack in which the victim either receives some injury from an offender with a weapon or is seriously injured by a weaponless offender; includes (see also) Bodily injury with a weapon and Severe injury without a weapon.

Anglo: a white person not of Spanish origin.

Armed robbery: a personal crime in which an offender with a weapon takes the victim's property or cash; without assault, by threatening (without actually attacking or injuring) the victim; with assault, by attacking the victim in a manner that could or does result in injuries.

Assault: a personal crime, including (see also) Aggravated assault, Simple assault, Attempted assault, and Rape, in which an offender unlawfully attacks or attempts to attack the victim.

Attempted armed robbery: a personal crime in which an offender with a weapon tries but fails to take the victim's property.

Attempted assault: a personal crime in which an offender with a weapon attacks (but does not injure) the victim, or an offender with or without a weapon threatens the victim with harm; subcategories are attempted assault with a weapon and attempted assault without a weapon (see also Weapon).

Attempted auto theft: a type of property (not personal or commercial) crime in which an offender tries but fails to take, without prior permission, the motor vehicle of a person who is absent or does not come into contact with the offender during the incident (see also Motor vehicle).

Attempted burglary: a type of commercial crime in which an offender tries but fails to break into or illegally enter a business or other commercial establishment, including incidents in which the offender tries to hide during closing to break out later.

Attempted forcible entry: a type of property (not commercial) crime; a burglary in which an offender tries but fails to enter a structure by using force (evidenced by a broken window, jimmied lock, slashed screen, etc.), without coming into contact with the occupant(s).

Attempted larceny: a type of property (not personal or commercial) crime in which an offender tries but fails to take property belonging to a person who is absent or does not come into contact with the offender during the incident.

Attempted pocket picking: see Other personal larceny.

Attempted purse snatch with force: a personal crime in which a weaponless offender tries but fails to take the victim's purse by attacking the victim in a manner that could or does result in injury.

Attempted purse snatch without force: see Other personal larceny.

Attempted rape: a personal crime in which an offender threatens or tries but fails to force a victim to have sexual intercourse against the victim's will.

Attempted robbery: a type of commercial crime in which an offender uses violence or threats to try to force the owner or employee of a business or other commercial establishment to give up the establishment's property.

Attempted strong-arm robbery: a personal crime in which a weaponless offender tries but fails to take the victim's property or cash by threatening the victim with harm or by attacking the victim in a manner that could or does result in injury.

Auto theft: a type of property (not personal or commercial) crime in which an offender takes or tries to take the motor vehicle of a person who is absent or does not come into contact with the offender during the incident; including any self-propelled vehicle that runs on the road, not on rails, such as a car, truck, bus, motorcycle, motor scooter, etc. The offender may be a stranger (implying no prior permission) or someone known to the car owner (implying prior permission, in which case a theft would occur only if the vehicle were not returned.).

Bodily injury with a weapon: a type of personal crime; an aggravated assault in which the victim receives either minor injuries (bruises, black eye, small cuts, scratches, swellings) or serious injuries (knocked unconscious, broken bones or teeth, internal injury) from an offender with a weapon (see also Weapon).

Burglary (commercial): a type of commercial crime in which an offender breaks into or illegally enters a business or other commercial establishment, whether or not something is taken, including incidents in which the offender hides during closing, then breaks out.

Burglary (household): a property crime in which an offender illegally enters or attempts to enter a structure (house, apartment, room, barn, garage, shed) with or without taking something from the structure, without coming into contact with the occupant(s); includes (see also) Forcible entry, Unlawful entry, and Attempted forcible entry.

Business establishment: includes (see also) Manufacturing, Real estate, Retail and wholesale, Service, and Other business establishments.

Car theft: a property crime in which a car is taken by a stranger, or taken and not returned by someone the car owner knows (relative, friend, employee, etc.) and in which the offender does not come into contact with the owner during the incident.

Commercial crimes: crimes, including robberies and burglaries, in which an offender takes or tries to take money and/or property from a business or other commercial establishment, association, or organization. (see also Business establishment and its subcategories: Manufacturing, Real estate, Retail and wholesale, Service, and Other business establishments).

Commercial establishment: See Business establishment.

Daytime: 6 a.m. to 6 p.m.

Education: the highest grade of regular schooling attended, excluding specialized schools offering no credit toward a high school diploma or academic degree.

Ethnic origin: a person's statement of his origin or descent; determined by the lineage of a person's ancestors and not by religion. Persons with parents of different origins are considered to be of the same ethnic origin as the father.

Evening: 6 p.m. to midnight.

Family: two or more persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption living together in a household.

Family income: the income of the household head plus that of all family members living at home during the previous 12 months, including wages or salary, net income from business or farm, pensions, dividends, interest, rent, child support, unemployment or workmen's compensation, public assistance, or regular gifts; excluding insurance payments,

lump-sum inheritances, or proceeds of the sale of a house, car, or other personal property.

Forcible entry: a type of property (not commercial) crime; a burglary in which an offender enters a structure by using force (evidenced by a broken window, jimmied lock, slashed screen, etc.) without coming into contact with the occupant(s).

Grand larceny: a type of property (not personal or commercial) crime in which an offender takes property valued at $50 or more belonging to a person who is absent or does not come into contact with the offender during the incident.

Home, in or near: See Place of occurrence.

Household: all persons who occupy a housing unit, whether a person living alone, a family, or persons unrelated to each other sharing a housing unit.

Housing unit: a house, apartment, or room used as separate living quarters whose occupants live and eat separately from everyone else in the building and have either direct access through a common hall or complete and private kitchen facilities.

Incident: the occurrence of a criminal event. An incident may involve multiple victims (e.g., a street holdup of two persons who are together), or the same person may be the victim of several incidents during the year. To minimize duplicate counting of incidents, personal victimizations of employees during commercial robberies are discounted in the personal crimes sector.

Injury, bodily: See Bodily injury with a weapon.

Injury, minor: Bruises, black eye, small cuts, scratches, swellings.

Injury, serious: Knocked unconscious, broken bones or teeth, internal injury.

Injury, severe: See Severe injury without a weapon.

Larceny: a type of property (not personal or commercial) crime (excluding auto theft, pocket picking, and purse snatch without force) in which an offender takes or tries to take, without coming into contact with the owner, personal property such as items left outside the home (bicycle, lawn furniture) or inside a car (packages, clothes), car accessories (battery, hubcaps, tape deck), or personal belongings in a building open to the public; includes (see also) petty larceny, grand larceny, and attempted larceny.

Larceny, attempted: See Attempted larceny.

Larceny, grand: See Grand larceny.

Larceny, personal: See Personal larceny.

Larceny, petty: See Petty larceny.

Low-income area: a census tract with substantial numbers of persons with low incomes. The low-income threshold is a variable dependent upon family size, presence and number of family members younger than 18, sex of head, farm-nonfarm residence, and, in the case of one- and two-person families, age of head. The tracts that comprise the San Jose and Dayton low-income areas are, for the most part, geographically contiguous and contain about 13 percent of the population. The tracts designated for inclusion in this survey were delineated before the 1970 Census was completed. The following sets of tracts may differ slightly from those constructed as a result of the Decennial Census: in Santa Clara County, 5001-5020, 5031.01-5031.03, 5036.02, 5037.01, 5037.03, and 5051; in Montgomery County, 0001, 0017-0019, 0025-0034, 0038-0040, 0045, 0046, 0062, and 0065. For more information on the income thresholds and how they vary by demographic characteristics, see *General Social and Economic Characteristics, Final Report PC (1)-C1 United States Summary;* U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970; pp. App. 29-31.

Manufacturing establishment: an establishment primarily engaged in the mechanical or chemical transformation of substances into new products. These establishments are commonly described as plants, factories, or mills and characteristically use power-driven machines and material-handling equipment.

Marital status: see Married, Separated, Never married.

Married: includes persons who state they have a common-law marriage and persons

parted temporarily for reasons other than marital discord (employment, armed services, etc.).

Motor vehicle: any self-propelled vehicle that runs on the road, not on rails, such as a car, truck, bus, motorcycle, motor scooter, etc.

Never married: includes those persons whose only marriage has been annulled and those living together who do not mention common-law marriage.

Night: midnight to 6 a.m.

Other business or commercial establishments: agricultural services that operate from a business location or office (nurseries, landscape architects, veterinarians); communications activities (telegraph and telephone companies, TV and radio stations); construction firms (general contractors, such as home, road, and bridge builders, and special trade contractors, such as electrical, plumbing, and painting firms); utilities and sanitary services (electric power, natural gas, water, refuse collection); finance and credit services (credit unions, small loan companies, savings and loan associations); insurance activities (insurance agencies, insurance home offices, insurance claims services); transportation services (railroads, buses, household goods movers, truck freight haulers, steamship lines, airlines); mineral extraction businesses (oil wells, rock quarries, gravel pits, coal mines); auxiliary business locations (administrative offices, warehouses, garages); and organizations operated on a non-profit basis (professional associations, civic and social associations, religious and charitable organizations).

Other motor vehicle: any self-propelled vehicle that runs on the road, not on rails, except a car; such as a truck, bus, motorcycle, motor scooter, etc.

Other motor vehicle theft: a property crime in which any motor vehicle except a car is taken by a stranger, or taken and not returned by someone the owner knows, and in which the offender does not come into contact with the owner during the incident.

Other personal larceny: a personal crime (exclusive of pocket picking) in which an offender deprives or tries to deprive the victim of property on his person without using a weapon, threatening, or attacking the victim; includes attempted pocket picking, purse snatch without force, and attempted purse snatch without force.

Other weapon: other than a gun or knife, anything used to injure or attempt to injure the victim seriously (razor, hatchet, ax, scissors, broken bottle or glass, brick, jack handle, tire iron, explosives, acid, lye, poison); a thrown object is considered a weapon only if the victim is injured and the offender is at least 12 years old; see also Weapon.

Personal crimes: crimes, including (see also) Attempted or completed robbery, Assault, and Personal larceny, during which the victim is present.

Personal larceny: a personal crime in which an offender deprives or tries to deprive the victim of property on his person without using a weapon or threatening or attacking the victim; includes (see also) Attempted and completed Pocket picking and Purse snatch without force.

Petty larceny: a type of property (not personal or commercial) crime in which an offender takes property valued at less than $50 belonging to a person who is absent or does not come into contact with the offender during the incident.

Place of occurrence: "in or near own home" includes the yard, sidewalk, garage, or other buildings on the property. "Street/park/field" includes playgrounds, parking lots, or any outdoor place not "near own home." "School/store/office" means inside any commercial building, factory, or warehouse. "Elsewhere" means inside a public conveyance or station; the home of a friend, relative, or neighbor; a vacation home; or any other place not listed above.

Property crimes: crimes in which the offender takes or tries to take something belonging to a person who is absent or does not come into contact with the offender during the incident; includes (see also) Burglary, Larceny, and Auto theft.

Property damage: a term referring only to the damage incurred during the forced entry of a building, not to merchandise or possessions damaged but not taken, clothing damaged during an assault, car damages incurred during a theft of objects from within the car, etc.

Purse snatch with force: a type of robbery; a personal crime in which a weaponless offender takes a purse from the victim's person by attacking the victim in a manner that could or does result in injury.

Purse snatch without force: see Other personal larceny.

Race or color: white, black, or other, determined by the interviewer by observation. The race of persons not present during the interview and not related to the household head was determined by asking the respondent for the household. Persons whose parents were of different races were considered to be of the same race as the father. "Other" includes persons whose origin is oriental, American Indian, Eskimo, etc. Persons of Spanish-American origin are white unless they consider themselves to be black or other.

Rape: a personal crime in which an offender forces, threatens, or intimidates the victim into having sexual intercourse against the victim's will (but because murder is not included in this survey, a victim both raped and murdered would not be included in this survey).

Real estate establishment: a business such as a realty firm, apartment building, commercial building, rental agency, real estate holding company, etc.

Recorded crime: information obtained from police records about crime reported to the police (as opposed to reported crime, which is information obtained from the victim about crime reported to the police).

Recovered: concerning personal or property crimes, refers to stolen property and/or cash returned (by the police, the offender, or someone else) or replaced by an insurance company, including cash settlements; for commercial crimes, refers to insurance company settlements only.

Reported crime: information obtained from the victim about crime reported to the police (as opposed to recorded crime, which is information obtained from police records about crime reported to the police).

Retail and wholesale establishments: "retail" refers to any establishment open to the general public that sells goods primarily to individuals for their own use, such as a food or general merchandise store, auto dealer, service station, furniture and appliance store, eating and/or drinking place, drugstore, liquor store, bookstore, sporting goods store, etc.; "wholesale" refers to an establishment selling goods to other businesses for resale to consumers or selling goods to business or industrial clients for their own use, such as a bulk oil dealer, office equipment and furniture dealer, terminal grain elevator, etc.

Robbery (commercial): a type of commercial crime in which an offender uses violence or threats to force the owner or employee of a business or other commercial establishment to give up the establishment's property.

Robbery (personal): a type of personal crime in which an offender uses force, violence, or threats to deprive or try to deprive the victim of his property; includes (see also) Strong-arm robbery, Armed robbery, and Purse snatch with force.

School/store/office: See Place of occurrence.

Separated: includes married persons who have a legal separation or have parted because of marital discord, but not those temporarily separated for other reasons (employment, armed services, etc.).

Service establishment: an establishment primarily engaged in providing services to other businesses or in providing professional services, lodging, personal or repair services, or amusement or recreation facilities to the general public, such as a hotel, motel, barber or beauty shop, dry cleaner, funeral home, advertising agency, equipment or vehicle rental agency, auto or other repair service, theater, bowling alley, health service (doctor, hospital), nongovernment educational service, law firm, engineering service, accounting service, etc.

Severe injury without a weapon: a type of personal crime; an aggravated assault in which

a weaponless offender injures the victim seriously (knocked unconscious, broken bones or teeth, internal injury).

Simple assault: a type of personal crime in which a weaponless offender attacks the victim in a manner that does result in minor injuries or could but does not result in some injury.

Stranger-to-stranger personal crimes: robberies, assaults, and personal larcenies in which the victim reported not knowing the offender or offenders or not knowing if the offender was a stranger, or in which the relationship between the victim and offender was not ascertained.

Street/park/field: See Place of occurrence.

Strong-arm robbery: a personal crime in which a weaponless offender takes the victim's property or cash by threatening or attacking the victim: without assault, by threatening without actually attacking or injuring the victim; with assault, by attacking the victim in a manner that could or does result in injuries.

Time of occurrence: daytime (6 a.m. to 6 p.m.), evening (6 p.m. to midnight), or night (midnight to 6 a.m.).

Unlawful entry: a type of property (not commercial) crime; a burglary in which an offender enters without force a structure in which he has no legal right to be, without coming into contact with the occupant(s).

Unreported crime: crime about which the victim stated that the police were not informed.

Victim: a person, household, or commercial establishment reporting a victimization experience. In the personal crimes area, several victims may be involved in the same incident.

Victimization rate: number of units (persons, households, or businesses) per 100 units victimized by one or more crimes (personal, property, or commercial) during all of 1970.

Victimized: a term referring to the number or percentage of units (persons, households, or businesses) with one or more crimes (personal, property, or commercial, respectively) during all of 1970. The number victimized one or more times will likely be less than the totals of each category and subcategory of crime, because one victim is counted only once in each total or subtotal even though victimized more than once. The number of persons victimized one or more times may be more or less than the number of incidents of crimes, because of several victims in one incident or several crimes against one victim. The number of households or businesses victimized one or more times is always less than the number of incidents, because it was assumed that only one household or business was involved in each incident.

Weapon: Any object or substance used to injure or attempt to injure a victim or victims in such a way as to place them in danger; the object or substance may not be used merely to perform a break-in but must be used in a personal confrontation with the victim. A thrown object is considered a weapon only if the victim is injured and the offender is at least 12 years old; otherwise, the victim is considered to be threatened with harm.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. *The San Jose Methods Test of Known Crime Victims*, by Anthony G. Turner. Statistics Division Technical Series, Report No. 1. Washington, D.C. Government Printing Office, 1972.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. "Victimization Surveying: Its History, Uses, and Limitations." *Report on the Criminal Justice System.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. *The Challenge of Crime in A Free Society.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

_____. *Criminal Victimization in the United States: A Report of a National Survey.* Field Surveys II. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

_____. *Report on a Pilot Study in the District of Columbia on Victimization and Attitudes Toward Law Enforcement*, by Albert D. Biderman, Louise A. Johnson, Jennie McIntyre, and Adrianne W. Weir. Field Surveys I. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

_____. *Studies in Crime and Law Enforcement in Major Metropolitan Areas*, Albert J. Reiss, ed. Field Surveys III, Vol. I. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

_____. *Task Force Report: Crime and Its Impact—An Assessment.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Small Business Administration. *Crime Against Small Business: A Report of the Small Business Administration.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Demographic Surveys Division. "Household Survey of Victims of Crime, Second Pretest (Baltimore, Maryland)." Washington, D.C., 1970. (Duplicated.)

_____. "Victim Recall Pretest (Washington, D.C.)." Washington, D.C., 1970. (Duplicated.)

OTHER

Biderman, Albert D. "Surveys of Population Samples for Estimated Crime Incidence." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 374, November, 1967.

_____. "Time Distortions of Victimization Data and Mnemonic Effects." BSSR No. 003-20. Washington, D.C.: By Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., 1990 M Street, N.W., 1970. (Duplicated.)

_____. and Reiss, Albert J., Jr. "On Exploring the 'Dark Figure' of Crime." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 374, November, 1967.

District of Columbia Government. Office of Crime Analysis. *A Study of Citizens' Reaction to Crime in the District of Columbia and Adjacent Suburbs.* Preliminary Report. Washington, D.C.: Government of the District of Columbia, 1972; Final Report, forthcoming.

_____. *A Survey of Attitudes and Knowledge of Residents of the District of Columbia Concerning Crime and the Community Law Enforcement/Criminal Justice System.* Preliminary Report. Washington, D.C.: Government of the District of Columbia, forthcoming.

Dodge, Richard W., and Turner, Anthony G. "Methodological Foundations for Establishing a National Survey of Victimization." *Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, American Statistical Association Annual Meeting, Fort Collins, Colo., Aug. 23-26, 1971.* Invited paper. Washington, D.C.: 1971.

Glaser, Daniel. "Theoretical Implications of Victim Survey Research." Invited paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, Calif., Aug. 28-31, 1967.

Institute for Local Self Government. *Criminal Victimization in Maricopa County.* Berkeley, Calif.: Institute for Local Self-Government, Claremont Hotel Building, 1969.

Richardson, Richard J.; Williams, Oliver; Denyer, Thomas; McGaughey, Skip; and Walker, Darlene. *Perspectives on the Legal Justice System: Public Attitudes and Criminal Victimization.* Chapel Hill, N.C.: Institute for Research in Social Science, Manning Hall, University of North Carolina, 1972.

Turner, Anthony G., and Dodge, Richard W. "Surveys of Personal and Organizational Victimization." *Crime and the Public.* Paper presented at the Bureau of Social Science Research Symposium on Studies of Public Experience, Knowledge and Opinions of Crime and Justice, Washington, D.C., March 16-18, 1972. New York: Appleton Century-Croft, forthcoming.

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE:1974 545-414/579 1-3

049

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20530

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, $300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
JUS-436

SPECIAL FOURTH-CLASS RA
BOOK

rary
ngato
I. St
-04
er

JAN 2 0 1988

WERT
BOOKBINDING
Grantville, Pa.
Nov-Dec 1987
We're Quality Bound